

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9924

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 15, 1954

Mr. SHORT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized
5 further to develop military installations and facilities by
6 providing family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the construction or instal-
8 lation of public works, which include site preparation,
9 appurtenances, utilities, equipment and the acquisition
10 of land, as follows:

1 CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

2 (Third Army Area)

3 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Three hundred and twenty-
4 five units of family housing, \$4,906,000. —

5 (Fourth Army Area)

6 Fort Bliss, Texas: Two hundred and seventy-two units
7 of family housing, \$3,845,000.

8 Fort Hood, Texas: Six hundred and thirty-nine units
9 of family housing, \$9,548,000.

10 (Fifth Army Area)

11 Camp Carson, Colorado: One thousand four hundred and
12 forty-seven units of family housing, \$21,508,000.

13 Camp Crowder, Missouri: Seventy-four units of family
14 housing, \$1,106,000.

15 (Sixth Army Area)

16 Fort Lewis, Washington: One thousand one hundred
17 and ten units of family housing, \$16,450,000.

18 Camp Cooke (United States Disciplinary Barracks),
19 California: Fifty units of family housing, \$737,000.

20 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Twenty units of family
21 housing, \$297,000.

22 (Quartermaster Corps)

23 Belle Mead General Depot, New Jersey: Ten units of
24 family housing, \$176,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Thirty units of family housing, \$499,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Two hundred and eight units of family housing, \$3,102,000.

Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Virginia: Ten units of family housing, \$168,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Three hundred and six units of family housing, \$4,460,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Two hundred and seventy-one units of family housing, \$4,065,000.

Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, North Carolina: Four units of family housing, \$77,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Ten units of family housing, \$178,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Three units of family housing, \$88,000.

Killeen Base, Texas: Five units of family housing, \$110,000.

1 (Tactical Sites)

2 Various locations: Three hundred units of family hous-
3 ing, \$4,433,000.

4 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized fur-
5 ther to develop military installations and facilities by pro-
6 viding family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public
8 works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment,
9 in a total amount of \$13,254,000.

10 TITLE II

11 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized fur-
12 ther develop naval installations and facilities by providing
13 family housing for personnel of the military departments and
14 their dependents by the construction or installation of public
15 works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utili-
16 ties, equipment and the acquisition of land as follows:

17 CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

18 (First Naval District)

19 Naval hospital, Newport, Rhode Island: Ten units of
20 family housing, \$152,000.

21 (Third Naval District)

22 Naval hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Ten units of
23 family housing, \$151,900.

1 (Fourth Naval District)

2 Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Twenty-
3 five units of family housing, \$321,300.

4 Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ten units of
5 family housing, \$152,000.

6 (Fifth Naval District)

7 Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Fifty
8 units of family housing, \$642,500.

9 Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina:
10 Thirty-five units of family housing, \$473,300.

11 Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Ten units of
12 family housing, \$152,000.

13 Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Virginia (Skiffes Creek
14 Annex) : Five units of family housing, \$91,200.

15 (Sixth Naval District)

16 Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Ninety-five units
17 of family housing, \$1,272,900.

18 Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Thirty units of
19 family housing, \$397,300.

20 Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Twenty units of
21 family housing \$273,900.

22 Naval station, Key West, Florida: Eighty-three units of
23 family housing, \$1,085,400.

1 Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City,
2 Florida: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$343,100.

3 Naval hospital, Pensacola, Florida: Twenty-five units of
4 family housing, \$321,300.

5 Naval supply corps school, Athens, Georgia: Thirty
6 units of family housing, \$456,000.

7 Naval auxiliary air station, Glynco, Georgia: Eighty-
8 three units of family housing, \$1,115,900.

9 Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Missis-
10 sippi: Seven units of family housing, \$102,100.

11 Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South Caro-
12 lina: One hundred and eighty-five units of family housing,
13 \$2,546,900.

14 Naval hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina: Fifty units
15 of family housing, \$654,300.

16 (Eighth Naval District)

17 Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Eighty
18 units of family housing, \$1,096,900.

19 (Eleventh Naval District)

20 Naval amphibious base, Coronado, California: Two units
21 of family housing, \$47,300.

22 Naval air station, Miramar, California: Fifteen units
23 of family housing, \$204,500.

24 Naval hospital, San Diego, California: Ten units of
25 family housing, \$152,000.

1 (Twelfth Naval District)

2 Naval hospital, Oakland, California: Ten units of family
3 housing, \$152,000.

4 Naval supply center, Oakland, California: Ten units of
5 family housing, \$152,000.

6 Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, California:
7 Fifty units of family housing, \$666,000.

8 Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Sixty units
9 of family housing, \$787,500.

10 (Potomac River Naval Command)

11 Naval hospital, Bethesda, Maryland: Thirty units of fam-
12 ily housing, \$409,000.

13 Naval district area: Four units of family housing,
14 \$108,000.

15 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

16 Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Georgia: One
17 hundred and nineteen units of family housing, \$1,595,700.

18 Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, California: One
19 unit of family housing, \$27,000.

20 Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California:
21 Twelve units of family housing, \$173,400.

22 Marine Corps school, Quantico, Virginia: Three hundred
23 and thirty-two units of family housing, \$4,730,300.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Atlantic Ocean Area)

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Forty-five units of family housing, \$595,100.

Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,379,000.

Naval air activities, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: One hundred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$2,366,300.

(Pacific Ocean Area)

Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: One hundred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$2,312,600.

Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: Two units of family housing, \$30,400.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$1,218,300.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation

1 of public works, which include site preparation, appurte-
2 nances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as
3 follows:

4 CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

5 (Strategic Air Command)

6 Sedalia Air Force Base, Missouri: Four hundred and
7 eighteen units of family housing, \$6,042,450.

8 Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma: Three hundred and
9 seventy units of family housing, \$5,340,950.

10 Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebraska: Four hundred and
11 forty-three units of family housing, \$6,397,300.

12 Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kansas: Two hundred and
13 ninety-three units of family housing, \$4,230,850.

14 Dow Air Force Base, Maine: Three hundred and five
15 units of family housing, \$4,401,850.

16 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana: Two hundred
17 and fifty-three units of family housing, \$3,651,650.

18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona: Five units of
19 family housing, \$108,000.

20 Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of
21 family housing, \$108,000.

22 Great Falls Air Force Base, Montana: Four units of
23 family housing, \$87,750.

24 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia: Five units of family
25 housing, \$108,000.

1 Larson Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of
2 family housing, \$108,000.

3 Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: Four units of family
4 housing, \$87,750.

5 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: Four units of family
6 housing, \$87,750.

7 Mather Air Force Base, California: Four units of family
8 housing, \$87,750.

9 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: Four units of
10 family housing, \$81,000.

11 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: Five units of family
12 housing, \$108,000.

13 Travis Air Force Base, California: Six units of family
14 housing, \$128,250.

15 (Air Defense Command)

16 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York: One hun-
17 dred and eleven units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

18 Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts: Two hundred and
19 thirty units of family housing, \$3,324,850.

20 Newcastle County Airport, Delaware: One hundred
21 and eight units of family housing, \$1,559,200.

22 Truax Air Force Base, Wisconsin: One hundred and
23 eleven units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

24 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan: Ninety-four units
25 of family housing, \$1,355,100.

1 Paine Air Force Base, Washington: Seventy-four units
2 of family housing, \$1,069,200.

3 Oxnard Air Force Base, California: Seventy-four units
4 of family housing, \$1,069,200.

5 Ent Air Force Base, Colorado: One hundred units of
6 family housing, \$1,444,300.

7 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: Fifty-seven units of
8 family housing, \$824,200.

9 Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pennsylvania: Fifty-seven
10 units of family housing, \$824,200.

11 Niagara Municipal Airport, New York: Fifty-seven
12 units of family housing, \$824,200.

13 Minneapolis-Saint Paul Airport, Minnesota: Seventy-
14 four units of family housing, \$1,069,200.

15 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota: One hundred and
16 eleven units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

17 Geiger Field, Washington: Fifty-seven units of family
18 housing, \$824,200.

19 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: Fifty-seven units
20 of family housing, \$824,200.

21 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: Fifty-three units of
22 family housing, \$763,050.

23 McGee-Tyson Airport, Tennessee: Fifty-seven units of
24 family housing, \$824,200.

1 Portland International Airport, Oregon: Sixty-three
2 units of family housing, \$906,000.

3 Minot area, North Dakota: Seventy-one units of family
4 housing, \$1,028,300.

5 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan: Fifty-one units
6 of family housing, \$735,000.

7 (Tactical Air Command)

8 Clovis Air Force Base, New Mexico: One hundred and
9 eighty-five units of family housing, \$2,671,650.

10 Hurlburt Air Force Base, Florida: Two hundred and
11 ninety-five units of family housing, \$4,258,900.

12 Foster Air Force Base, Texas: Two hundred and twenty-
13 two units of family housing, \$3,202,550.

14 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey: Five units of
15 family housing, \$108,000.

16 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina: Five units of
17 family housing, \$108,000.

18 (Air Training Command)

19 Luke Air Force Base, Arizona: One hundred and thirty-
20 three units of family housing, \$1,921,450.

21 Laredo Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and twelve
22 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

23 Gary Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and twelve
24 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

1 Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and
2 sixty-six units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

3 Greenville Air Force Base, Mississippi: One hundred and
4 twenty-nine units of family housing, \$1,860,300.

5 Moody Air Force Base, Georgia: One hundred and forty-
6 eight units of family housing, \$2,138,400.

7 Stead Air Force Base, Nevada: Ninety-two units of
8 family housing, \$1,329,400.

9 McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas: One hundred and
10 sixty-six units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

11 Webb Air Force Base, Texas: Ninety-two units of
12 family housing, \$1,329,400.

13 Parks Air Force Base, California: Ninety-two units of
14 family housing, \$1,329,400.

15 (Military Air Transport Service)

16 Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina: Five hun-
17 dred and four units of family housing, \$7,285,000.

18 (Continental Air Command)

19 Beale Air Force Base, California: Two hundred and
20 thirty-six units of family housing, \$3,406,650.

21 (Research and Development Command)

22 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico: Five units of
23 family housing, \$108,000.

24 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized

1 further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by pro-
2 viding family housing for personnel of the military depart-
3 ments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public
4 works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment,
5 in a total amount of \$4,250,000.

6 TITLE IV

7 SEC. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air
8 Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further
9 development of military, naval, and Air Force installations
10 and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act
11 without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and
12 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and
13 prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by
14 section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The
15 authority to provide family housing by the construction or
16 installation of public works shall include authority to acquire
17 lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including
18 the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange
19 of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

20 SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
21 not to exceed \$175,000,000 to carry out the purposes of titles
22 I, II, and III of this Act.

23 SEC. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in
24 titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the
25 Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 per centum,

1 but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount
2 authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

3 SEC. 404. Not to exceed two hundred and fifty of the
4 units of family quarters constructed under the authority of
5 titles I, II, and III of this Act shall have a net floor area of
6 not to exceed two thousand and one hundred square feet.
7 None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed
8 by this Act shall have a net floor area in excess of one thou-
9 sand two hundred and fifty square feet, and the average net
10 floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed
11 one thousand and eighty square feet.

12 SEC. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose
13 of this Act shall be available for expenses incident to con-
14 struction or rehabilitation work authorized by this Act, in-
15 cluding administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

16 SEC. 406. Whenever—

17 (a) the President determines that compliance with
18 the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second
19 Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this
20 Act with respect to the establishment or development of
21 military installations and facilities in foreign countries
22 would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions
23 of this Act; and

24 (b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
25 General have agreed upon alternative methods for con-

A BILL

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SHORT

JULY 15, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

1 ducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President
2 is authorized to exempt such contracts from the require-
3 ments of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress.

AUTHORIZING FAMILY HOUSING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

JULY 19, 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. SHORT, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 9924]

The Committee on Armed Services to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H. R. 9924 authorizes the military departments to provide family housing for personnel of the Armed Forces by the construction of 13,613 units, including replacement of substandard housing, and the rehabilitation of additional units, but at a total cost of not to exceed \$175 million. The bill would provide for less than 10 percent of the family housing needs of the Armed Forces even on the basis of the permanent hard core strength of the Armed Forces which is but little more than 50 percent of its strength at the present time or in the foreseeable future. This authorization is recommended to enable the military departments to make a modest start toward alleviating the critical shortage of housing for military personnel until the housing problem can be given more detailed study and a long-range plan evolved.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

Historically, the Armed Forces have provided housing for the military personnel through housing constructed with appropriated funds. A monetary allowance for quarters is paid to such personnel only when the Government has failed in its primary obligation to furnish

public quarters. The failure in recent years to provide adequate housing for military personnel has not only created a serious morale problem but has necessitated the appropriation of large sums of money for quarters allowances, which over a period of relatively few years amounts to more than the original cost of public quarters for the personnel receiving the allowances and the cost of maintaining and operating the public quarters and also the interest cost to the Government on its original investment. Attention in this connection is invited to the table set out below which indicates the quarters allowance appropriated for the military services for fiscal year 1954 and the budget estimate for fiscal year 1955. It will be noted that over \$1,304 million was appropriated for quarters allowances for officers and enlisted men for fiscal year 1954. Every housing unit built under this bill will mean that no appropriation need be made for the man occupying that unit. After about 14 years, that family unit will be wholly amortized through housing allowances which would have been appropriated during that time. From then on, the only cost to the Government will be normal maintenance and operation.

Quarters allowances in fiscal year 1954 and 1955 budget estimates

[In thousands]

	Officers		Enlisted		Total	
	1954	1955	1954	1955	1954	1955
Army.....	\$113,644	\$107,648	\$398,712	\$351,813	\$512,376	\$459,461
Navy.....	74,942	70,153	245,647	238,618	320,589	308,771
Marine Corps.....	16,813	16,506	58,253	45,005	75,066	61,511
Air Force.....	131,865	138,773	264,566	286,443	396,412	425,216
Total.....	337,264	333,080	967,178	921,879	1,304,443	1,254,959

Estimated quarters allowances not paid because Government-owned quarters are furnished dependents

[In thousands]

	Officers		Enlisted		Total	
	1954	1955	1954	1955	1954	1955
Army.....	\$28,700	\$28,700	\$31,400	\$31,400	\$60,100	\$60,100
Navy.....	6,876	6,936	6,924	6,970	13,800	13,906
Marine Corps.....	2,053	2,069	1,353	1,627	3,436	3,696
Air Force.....	15,542	15,961	19,222	19,504	34,764	35,465
Total.....	53,171	53,666	58,929	59,501	112,100	113,167

Much of the increase in size of the Armed Forces to their present levels has occurred since the outbreak of the Korean conflict. In spite of that fact, the total number of units of family housing authorized to be constructed in continental United States since that date has been insignificant. In Public Law 564 of the 81st Congress, which was the last military construction act prior to the beginning of the Korean conflict, not a single unit of family housing was authorized to be constructed in continental United States, although that act authorized other construction totaling \$594 million. The total available family housing built in the past through the use of appropriated funds consists of 37,000 permanent units and 41,400 temporary units.

Those units, even when supplemented with other housing built under title VIII and other titles of the National Housing Act, leave a deficit of approximately 150,000 units of family housing, based upon the permanent strength of the Armed Forces which is considerably less than the present strength.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Title VIII of the National Housing Act (known as the Wherry Act) has served a very useful function in alleviating the housing shortage. It is essentially a program for the construction of family housing through the use of private capital although (1) the Wherry mortgages are insured to 90 percent by the Government through the FHA, (2) a secondary mortgage market is provided through FNMA, and (3) public funds are used to assist in certain of the costs up to a total of \$1,500 a unit. That program now totals 88,000 units of family housing, of which 66,000 units have been completed and 22,000 additional units are under construction or are in the process of development with FHA. Title VIII is, however, a temporary authorization and would under legislation now pending in the Congress be extended to June 30, 1955. It is deficient principally in its ability to furnish housing for the lower grades of enlisted personnel because of rental limitations and in the upper grades of officer personnel because of size and cost limitations and to furnish housing at installations which the services have not committed and certified as being permanent installations. Also, a number of Wherry projects, principally in isolated and in high-cost areas, have not materialized because of the absence of a private sponsor. In one instance, at Fort Lewis, Wash., where housing is authorized by this bill, title VIII cannot be used because of the conditions attached to the title of the land held at that base by the Government. The committee has by no means discarded title VIII as one of the means of solving the family housing problem. However, the committee realizes that title VIII could not be relied upon to solve more than a part of the housing shortage without a substantial modification. In any event, H. R. 9924 is merely a measure designed to fill at this time a portion of the most critical housing needs until a long-range and more comprehensive housing program can be settled upon.

Title IX of the National Housing Act has also filled a portion of the housing needs of the Armed Forces. To date, more than 50,000 units have been completed for use by military personnel and an additional 7,000 units are in the process of being constructed. That program is, however, designed for ultimate use by the civilian market and military personnel are accorded a priority in their use for only 2 years in most cases. Many of the units provided under this title were intended for use by civilian defense workers rather than by military personnel. Instances were revealed to the Committee where military tenants were evicted from title IX housing which was removed from the rental market and placed on the sales market which does not aid military personnel who constantly move. Moreover, in many instances, the rentals charged for title IX housing are beyond the economic ability of the prospective military tenants. The committee is convinced that title IX, or any program of a similar nature, is not a solution to the housing problem of the Armed Forces.

Title III of the National Housing Act has also been useful in providing housing for military personnel. The units provided under title III are, however, temporary units and most of them are of a trailer type. Over 11,500 such units have been completed and the total military program is approximately 12,200. Title III housing is at best a temporary expedient and cannot be relied upon to fill the permanent requirements of the Armed Forces. Because of the short life and high maintenance cost, this type of housing is very expensive and unsatisfactory in the long run. Still other types of housing, such as Lanham Act housing, have been made available to the military departments. Substantially all of such housing has the same objectionable features.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

In its review of the line items contained in the bill, the committee took appropriate notice of the community support provided from housing in which there has been no Federal participation, that is to say, the normal privately owned dwelling which is available for occupancy on a rental basis by our military. It was evident from the testimony received that housing of this kind would not be adversely affected by the authorization contained in this bill.

LEASE-PURCHASE CONCEPT

The committee considered the use of a lease-purchase arrangement such as was recently authorized for the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General. The lease-purchase arrangement is not deemed to be suitable for providing housing for the military departments. This is particularly true where the housing would be located at isolated, or relatively isolated, locations. Informal discussions by representatives of the Department of Defense with lending institutions indicated that those lending institutions would not be anxious to invest money in such housing because of the inability to use such housing in the general market in the event there is a change in planning by the military departments eliminating the requirement for such housing. In view of that fact, the private lending institutions would be interested in investing in such housing only if the interest were set at a rate that would be so high that the cost of the housing would be prohibitive as compared to other means of furnishing such housing.

REVOLVING FUND CONCEPT

The committee also considered the use of revolving funds for the construction as well as the maintenance and operation of housing. Such a revolving fund would be replenished through the recapture of rental allowances paid to military personnel which would otherwise, from the Government's standpoint, be paid out and dissipated. The use of such a revolving fund would, in essence, involve the construction of family housing through the use of public funds. The revolving fund would, however, place the construction and operation of such housing on a businesslike basis and present the Congress with a clearer picture of the cost of public quarters so that a more accurate comparison of their cost with housing constructed through other means can be made. The committee realizes that the initiation of such a revolving fund concept in this field involves the introduction of certain new

concepts, principally the investment of revolving fund assets in capital investments and the charging of rental for housing that would ordinarily be furnished to military personnel without charge although without also the payment of quarters allowances. Because of these novel features of the revolving fund concept, the committee decided to defer action on it until the committee has had an opportunity to study and explore the matter further. The committee feels that the revolving fund concept has definite merit but that it could be deferred to a later date and that any housing constructed at this time through the use of appropriated funds could at a later date be brought under the operation of any revolving fund that may be set up for the purpose of providing family housing.

EXAMPLE OF HOUSING SITUATION

The committee was sufficiently struck with the following example of the urgency of the need for family quarters to include it in this report. The military installation involved was a Strategic Air Command key station. At this station, the Air Force has 3,500 families living off the station. Recently an airman reported to his commander that he either had to be assigned quarters on the station, receive an increase in pay, or seek some method of separation from the service. He was forced to occupy a set of quarters in the local community for an approximate rental, including utilities, of \$125 per month. His basic pay is \$107.02 and his quarters allowance is \$77.10. The airman pointed out that he had to give up his automobile, he had been unable to pay for adequate clothes for his youngster, and at the present time they were running out of food and had no money to buy essential food items for the remainder of the month. The commander inspected the set of quarters occupied by the airman and found them clean, quite small and though his wife and the child were spotlessly clean, they were not what one might consider well dressed, and it was apparent that they were certainly making a definite effort to maintain some dignified standard of living. All current bills were paid, but the airman could see no solution because each month the same conditions were going to continue. In discussing this case with this airman, the station commander pointed out that he had no set of quarters that he could assign to this airman on the base, which would have helped to some extent. The only solution that he could offer in this immediate case was an outright grant from the welfare fund of the necessary funds to meet living costs for the balance of that month. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. The Committee on Armed Services was informed this situation obtains at many stations throughout the United States.

In view of those observations and conclusions, the committee feels that there is a compelling need for family housing for military personnel that can be alleviated at this time only through the authorization on an emergency basis of the construction of a limited number of family housing units at this time. The committee wishes to stress that this measure is only a temporary expedient and will only provide a start toward a solution of the housing problem of the Armed Forces. The committee intends to pursue its studies of the problem with the view of developing early in the next Congress a more comprehensive

program for providing family housing for our military personnel through either public or private sources or combinations of both.

The Department of Defense originally submitted, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, a request for authority to construct 25,000 units of family housing and to rehabilitate other units of family housing at a total cost of \$350 million. The President in a supplemental appropriation request asked that \$175 million be made available for that purpose. It was the President's thought that the \$175 million of funds be made available from appropriations made this year for military public works and from appropriations made for these purposes in prior years. This means, of course, that no new funds will be required.

The original submission of the Department of Defense was, in effect, a request for a general authority to construct family housing units within the money limitation and without indication as to the numbers and locations.

The committee insisted upon a detailed line item list of the units of family housing that was proposed to be constructed. Thereafter, the committee carefully reviewed those line items and with the assistance of the Department of Defense reviewed that list and reduced it to those line items that are contained in H. R. 9924. It is believed that the line items in the bill are representative of the most critical housing needs of the military departments although it is recognized that there are other critical housing needs at the present time that are not reflected in those line items.

In reviewing the line items, the committee was especially conscious of possible impacts that the housing might have on other Government sponsored programs and on the community housing situation generally in the affected areas. The committee was particularly conscious of the obligation owed by the Government to existing or approved title VIII housing. In general, no housing was approved at locations at which a Wherry housing project is located or for which a Wherry housing project has been approved. Exceptions were made in the case of quarters to be constructed for senior officers for whom Wherry housing is not suitable because of the limitations imposed by title VIII. In other cases, exceptions were made for quarters to be constructed to replace existing but substandard housing inasmuch as the new family quarters would not lessen the total demand for housing.

Substantially all of the housing in overseas areas was eliminated from the line item list. Certain foreign housing for the Navy is included in the bill. However, such foreign housing is left in the bill with the clear understanding with the Department of Defense that it will not be used unless the Department is convinced, after suitable efforts have been made, that such housing cannot be obtained through the use of rental guaranties, which were previously authorized in military public works acts.

The committee feels that the modest housing program contained in H. R. 9924 is a sound one and will constitute an important step toward solving the critical housing shortage of the Armed Forces. At the same time, it will not prevent the Department of Defense from providing additional units of family housing through other available means such as title VIII of the National Housing Act.

COST DATA

This measure, in accordance with recommendations of the President as such are set out in House Document 408, 83d Congress, 2d session, will not require the appropriation of any new funds.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The proposed measure is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 83d Congress and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as is evidenced by the letter set out below which is made a part of this report.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
LEGISLATIVE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1954.

HON. DEWEY SHORT,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to H. R. 8726, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes, now pending before your committee.

During the testimony before your committee on that bill, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations stated that the Department of Defense intended in the near future to request authorization for the construction of family housing in a considerable amount for personnel of the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense now requests such an authorization in the form of an amendment to H. R. 8726 which would increase the authorization for public works in that bill by \$350 million.

Historically, the military departments have provided family housing for its personnel through direct appropriations for that purpose. During the past several years, however, the amount of family housing authorized in public works authorization bills has been insignificant in comparison with the needs of the Department of Defense. This is true also in the case of H. R. 8726 in its present form.

The Department of Defense has been able to satisfy a portion of those needs through the use of title VIII of the National Housing Act (known as the Wherry Act) and other temporary provisions contained in titles III and IX of that act. Sixty-four thousand three hundred and eighty units of Wherry housing have already been constructed, 13,611 are in the process of construction, and commitments have been made by the Federal Housing Administration for 1,283 additional units.

The Wherry Act has made a significant contribution toward alleviating the family housing problem of the Department of Defense. For that reason, the Department of Defense favors a year's extension of the Wherry Act, which will expire on June 30 of this year unless further extended by the Congress. However, this Department believes that its housing problem can be solved only if substantial funds are authorized and appropriated by the Congress for the direct construction and rehabilitation of family housing.

This amendment would authorize the appropriation of \$350 million for that purpose. It is estimated that that amount will enable the Department of Defense to provide approximately 25,000 new units of family housing at an estimated average cost of \$13,500 and to rehabilitate other existing units of family housing.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this amendment to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE
(For the Assistant Secretary.)

List by States of the Department of Defense family quarters bill

Arizona-----	\$5, 428, 450
Army (\$3,399,000):	
Fort Huachuca, 208 units-----	3, 102, 000
Yuma Test Station, 20 units-----	297, 000
Air Force (\$2,029,450):	
Davis Monthan AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
Luke AFB, 133 units-----	1, 921, 450
California-----	8, 463, 150
Army (\$915,000):	
Camp Cooke, 50 units-----	737, 000
Two Rock Ranch Station, 10 units-----	178, 000
Navy (\$1,526,900):	
Naval Hospital, San Diego, 10 units-----	152, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, 12 units-----	173, 400
Naval Communication Station, Skaggs Island, 50 units---	666, 000
Naval Air Station, Miramar, 15 units-----	204, 500
Marine Corps Supply Annex, Barstow, 1 unit-----	27, 000
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, 2 units-----	47, 300
Naval Supply Center, Oakland, 10 units-----	152, 000
Naval Hospital, Oakland, 10 units-----	152, 000
Air Force (\$6,021,250):	
Beale AFB, 236 units-----	3, 406, 650
Mather, AFB, 4 units-----	87, 750
Oxnard AFB, 74 units-----	1, 069, 200
Parks, AFB, 92 units-----	1, 329, 400
Travis AFB, 6 units-----	128, 250
Colorado-----	22, 952, 300
Army (\$21,508,000): Camp Carson, 1,447 units-----	21, 508, 000
Air Force (\$1,444,300): Ent AFB, 100 units-----	1, 444, 300
Delaware: Air Force (\$1,559,200): New Castle County Airport, 108 units-----	1, 559, 200
Florida-----	7, 952, 800
Navy (\$3,693,900):	
Naval Hospital, Pensacola, 25 units-----	321, 300
Naval Air Station, Key West, 20 units-----	273, 900
Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, 30 units-----	397, 300
Naval Mine Countermeasures Station, Panama City, 25 units-----	343, 100
Naval Station, Key West, 83 units-----	1, 085, 400
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, 95 units-----	1, 272, 900
Air Force (\$4,258,900): Hurlburt AFB, 295 units-----	4, 258, 900
Georgia-----	5, 414, 000
Navy (\$3,167,600):	
Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Albany, 119 units-----	1, 595, 700
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Glynco, 83 units-----	1, 115, 900
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, 30 units-----	456, 000
Air Force (\$2,246,400):	
Hunter AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
Moody AFB, 148 units-----	2, 138, 400
Idaho: Air Force (\$81,000): Mountain Home AFB, 4 units-----	81, 000
Iowa: Air Force (\$824,200): Sioux City Municipal Airport, 57 units-----	824, 200

List by States of the Department of Defense family quarters bill—Continued

Kansas-----	\$6, 629, 450
Air Force (\$6,629,450):	
McConnell AFB, 166 units-----	2, 398, 600
Smoky Hill AFB, 293 units-----	4, 230, 850
<hr/>	
Kentucky: Army (\$4,906,000): Fort Campbell, 325 units-----	4, 906, 000
Louisiana: Air Force (\$3,651,650): Lake Charles AFB, 253 units--	3, 651, 650
<hr/>	
Maine-----	5, 252, 650
<hr/>	
Air Force (\$5,252,650):	
Dow AFB, 305 units-----	4, 401, 850
Limestone AFB, 4 units-----	87, 750
Presque Isle AFB, 53 units-----	763, 050
<hr/>	
Maryland-----	517, 000
<hr/>	
Navy (\$517,000):	
Naval Hospital, Bethesda, 30 units-----	409, 000
Naval District Area, 4 units-----	108, 000
<hr/>	
Massachusetts: Air Force (\$3,324,850): Otis AFB, 230 units-----	3, 324, 850
<hr/>	
Michigan-----	2, 090, 100
<hr/>	
Air Force (\$2,090,100):	
Kinross AFB, 94 units-----	1, 355, 100
Wurtsmith AFB, 51 units-----	735, 000
<hr/>	
Minnesota-----	2, 671, 650
<hr/>	
Air Force (\$2,671,650):	
Duluth Municipal Airport, 111 units-----	1, 602, 450
Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport, 74 units-----	1, 069, 200
<hr/>	
Mississippi-----	1, 962, 400
<hr/>	
Navy (\$102,100): Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulf-	
port, 7 units-----	102, 100
Air Force (\$1,860,300): Greenville AFB, 129 units-----	1, 860, 300
<hr/>	
Missouri-----	7, 148, 450
<hr/>	
Army (\$1,106,000): Camp Crowder, 74 units-----	
Air Force (\$6,042,450): Sedalia AFB, 418 units-----	1, 106, 000
<hr/>	
Montana: Air Force (\$87,750): Great Falls AFB, 4 units-----	6, 042, 450
<hr/>	
Nebraska: Air Force (\$6,397,300): Lincoln AFB, 443 units-----	87, 750
<hr/>	
Nevada-----	6, 397, 300
<hr/>	
Navy (\$787,500): Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, 60	
units-----	2, 124, 900
<hr/>	
Air Force (\$1,337,400):	
Nellis AFB, 5 units-----	787, 500
Stead AFB, 92 units-----	108, 000
<hr/>	
New Jersey-----	1, 329, 400
<hr/>	
Army (\$176,000): Belle Mead General Depot, 10 units-----	
Air Force (\$108,000): McGuire AFB, 5 units-----	284, 000
<hr/>	
<hr/>	

10 AUTHORIZE FAMILY HOUSING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

List by States of the Department of Defense family quarters bill—Continued

New Mexico	\$2, 867, 650
Army (\$88,000): Sandia Base, 3 units	88, 000
Air Force (\$2,779,650):	
Clovis AFB, 185 units	2, 671, 650
Kirtland AFB, 5 units	108, 000
New York	2, 578, 650
Navy (\$152,000): Naval Hospital, St. Albans, 10 units	152, 000
Air Force (\$2,426,650):	
Niagara Municipal Airport, 57 units	824, 200
Suffolk County AFB, 111 units	1, 602, 450
North Carolina	1, 192, 800
Army (\$77,000): Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, 4 units ..	77, 000
Navy (\$1,115,800):	
Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, 50 units	642, 500
Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, 35 units	473, 300
North Dakota: Air Force (\$1,028,300): Minot, 71 units	1, 028, 300
Ohio	911, 950
Air Force (\$911,950):	
Lockbourne AFB, 4 units	87, 750
Youngstown Municipal Airport, 57 units	824, 200
Oklahoma: Air Force (\$5,340,950): Altus AFB, 370 units	5, 340, 950
Oregon: Air Force (\$906,000): Portland International Airport, 63 units	906, 000
Pennsylvania	1, 297, 500
Navy (\$473,300):	
Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, 25 units	321, 300
Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, 10 units	152, 000
Air Force (\$824,200): Greater Pittsburgh Airport, 57 units	824, 200
Rhode Island: Navy (\$152,000): Naval Hospital, Newport, 10 units	152, 000
South Carolina	10, 594, 200
Navy (\$3,201,200):	
Naval Hospital, Beaufort, 50 units	654, 300
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, 185 units ..	2, 546, 900
Air Force (\$7,393,000):	
Charleston AFB, 504 units	7, 285, 000
Shaw AFB, 5 units	108, 000
Tennessee: Air Force (\$824,200): McGee-Tyson Airport, 57 units ..	824, 200

List by States of the Department of Defense family quarters bill—Continued

Texas.....	\$24, 761, 050
Army (\$13,503,000):	
Fort Hood, 639 units.....	9, 548, 000
Fort Bliss, 272 units.....	3, 845, 000
Killeen Base, 5 units.....	110, 000
Navy (\$1,096,900): Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, 80 units.....	1, 096, 000
Air Force (\$10, 161, 150):	
Gary AFB, 112 units.....	1, 615, 300
Foster AFB, 222 units.....	3, 202, 550
Laredo AFB, 112 units.....	1, 615, 300
Laughlin AFB, 166 units.....	2, 398, 600
Webb AFB, 92 units.....	1, 329, 400
Utah: Army (\$499,000): Dugway Proving Ground, 30 units.....	499, 000
Virginia.....	13, 666, 500
Army (\$8,693,000):	
Department of the Army Transmitting Station, 10 units..	168, 000
Fort Belvoir, 306 units.....	4, 460, 000
Fort Eustis, 271 units.....	4, 065, 000
Navy (\$4,973,500):	
Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, 5 units.....	91, 200
Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, 10 units.....	152, 000
Marine Corps School Quantico, 332 units.....	4, 730, 300
Washington.....	18, 559, 400
Army (\$16,450,000): Fort Lewis, 1,110 units.....	16, 450, 000
Air Force (\$2,109,400):	
Fairchild AFB, 5 units.....	108, 000
Larson AFB, 5 units.....	108, 000
Paine AFB, 74 units.....	1, 069, 200
Geiger Field, 57 units.....	824, 200
Wisconsin: Air Force (\$1,602,450): Truax AFB, 111 units.....	1, 602, 450
Various locations: Army (\$4,433,000): 300 units.....	4, 433, 000
Outside continental United States.....	6, 683, 400
Navy (\$6,683,400):	
Naval Air Activities, Port Lyautey, French Morocco, 175 units.....	2, 366, 300
Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, 100 units.....	1, 379, 000
Marine Corps Barracks, Pearl Harbor, 2 units.....	30, 400
Naval Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands, 175 units....	2, 312, 600
Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, 45 units.....	595, 100



S. 3818

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

A BILL

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized
5 further to develop military installations and facilities by
6 providing family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the construction or instal-
8 lation of public works, which include site preparation,
9 appurtenances, utilities, equipment and the acquisition
10 of land, as follows:

1 CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

2 (Third Army Area)

3 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Three hundred units of
4 family housing, \$4,093,000.

5 (Fourth Army Area)

6 Fort Bliss, Texas: Two hundred and fifty units of
7 family housing, \$3,213,000.

8 Fort Hood, Texas: Six hundred units of family housing,
9 \$8,099,000.

10 (Fifth Army Area)

11 Camp Carson, Colorado: One thousand units of family
12 housing, \$13,427,000.

13 Camp Crowder, Missouri: Seventy units of family
14 housing, \$952,000.

15 (Sixth Army Area)

16 Fort Lewis, Washington: Eight hundred units of family
17 housing, \$10,686,000.

18 Camp Cooke (United States Disciplinary Barracks),
19 California: Fifty units of family housing \$663,000.

20 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Twenty units of family
21 housing, \$267,000.

22 (Quartermaster Corps)

23 Belle Mead General Depot, New Jersey: Ten units of
24 family housing, \$158,000.

1 (Chemical Corps)

2 Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Thirty units of family
3 housing, \$486,000.

4 (Signal Corps)

5 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Two hundred units of family
6 housing, \$2,899,000.

7 Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Vir-
8 ginia: Ten units of family housing, \$164,000.

9 (Corps of Engineers)

10 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Three hundred units of family
11 housing, \$3,984,000.

12 (Transportation Corps)

13 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Two hundred and fifty units
14 of family housing, \$3,374,000.

15 Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, North Carolina:
16 Four units of family housing, \$69,000.

17 (Army Security Agency)

18 Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Ten units of family
19 housing, \$160,000.

20 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

21 Sandia Base, New Mexico: Three units of family hous-
22 ing, \$79,000.

23 Killeen Base, Texas: Five units of family housing:
24 \$99,000.

1 (Tactical Sites)

2 Various locations: Three hundred units of family hous-
3 ing, \$3,990,000.

4 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized fur-
5 ther to develop military installations and facilities by pro-
6 viding family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public
8 works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment,
9 in a total amount of \$12,230,550: *Provided*, That in his dis-
10 cretion the Secretary of the Army may utilize the authoriza-
11 tion contained in this section to provide family housing by
12 the construction or installation of public works, which include
13 site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and
14 acquisition of land, at locations to be determined by him.
15 Such family housing shall be in addition to, but shall not
16 exceed 5 per centum of, the total number of units authorized
17 by section 101 of this Act, but the average cost of such
18 additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

19 TITLE II

20 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized fur-
21 ther to develop naval installations and facilities by providing
22 family housing for personnel of the military departments and
23 their dependents by the construction or installation of public
24 works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utili-
25 ties, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(First Naval District)

Naval hospital, Newport, Rhode Island: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Third Naval District)

Naval hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Fourth Naval District)

Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Fifth Naval District)

Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Fifty units of family housing, \$642,500.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina: Thirty-five units of family housing, \$473,300.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Virginia (Skiffes Creek Annex): Five units of family housing, \$91,200.

(Sixth Naval District)

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Ninety units of family housing, \$1,192,200.

1 Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Thirty units of
2 family housing, \$397,300.

3 Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Twenty units of
4 family housing, \$273,900.

5 Naval station, Key West, Florida: Eighty units of
6 family housing, \$1,044,500.

7 Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City,
8 Florida: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$343,100.

9 Naval hospital, Pensacola, Florida: Twenty-five units of
10 family housing, \$321,300.

11 Naval supply corps school, Athens, Georgia: Thirty
12 units of family housing, \$456,000.

13 Naval auxiliary air station, Glynco, Georgia: Eighty
14 units of family housing, \$1,058,600.

15 Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Missis-
16 sippi: Seven units of family housing, \$102,100.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South Carolina: One hundred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$2,305,600.

20 Naval hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina: Fifty units
21 of family housing, \$654,300.

22 (Eighth Naval District)

23 Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Eighty
24 units of family housing, \$1,073,400.

(Eleventh Naval District)

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, California: Two units of family housing, \$47,300.

Naval air station, Miramar, California: Fifteen units of family housing, \$204,500.

Naval hospital, San Diego, California: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Twelfth Naval District)

Naval hospital, Oakland, California: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, California: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, California: Fifty units of family housing, \$666,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Sixty units of family housing, \$787,500.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Georgia: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,339,800.

Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, California: One unit of family housing, \$27,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California: Twelve units of family housing, \$173,400.

1 Marine Corps school, Quantico, Virginia: Three hundred
2 units of family housing, \$4,121,700.

3 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

4 (Atlantic Ocean Area)

5 Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Forty-five
6 units of family housing, \$595,100.

7 Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: One hundred units
8 of family housing, \$1,379,000.

9 (Pacific Ocean Area)

10 Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: One hun-
11 dred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$2,289,100.

12 Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Ha-
13 waii: Two units of family housing, \$30,400.

14 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized fur-
15 ther to develop naval installations and facilities by providing
16 family housing for personnel of the military departments and
17 their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which
18 include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total
19 amount of \$1,218,300: *Provided*, That in his discretion the
20 Secretary of the Navy may utilize the authorization contained
21 in this section to provide family housing by the construction
22 or installation of public works, which include site prepara-
23 tion, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and acquisition of
24 land, at locations to be determined by him. Such family
25 housing shall be in addition to, but shall not exceed 5 per

centum of, the total number of units authorized by section 201 of this Act, but the average cost of such additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Strategic Air Command)

Sedalia Air Force Base, Missouri: Four hundred units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma: Three hundred and sixty units of family housing, \$4,827,600.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebraska: Four hundred units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kansas: Two hundred and eighty units of family housing, \$3,754,800.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine: Three hundred units of family housing, \$4,023,000.

- 1 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana: Two hundred
2 units of family housing, \$2,682,000.
- 3 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona: Five units of
4 family housing, \$108,000.
- 5 Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of
6 family housing, \$108,000.
- 7 Great Falls Air Force Base, Montana: Four units of
8 family housing, \$87,750.
- 9 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia: Five units of family
10 housing, \$108,000.
- 11 Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi: Thirty units of
12 family housing, \$402,300.
- 13 Larson Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of
14 family housing, \$108,000.
- 15 Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: Four units of family
16 housing, \$87,750.
- 17 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: Four units of family
18 housing, \$87,750.
- 19 Mather Air Force Base, California: Four units of family
20 housing \$87,750.
- 21 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: Four units of
22 family housing, \$81,000.
- 23 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: Five units of family
24 housing, \$108,000.

1 Travis Air Force Base, California: Six units of family
2 housing, \$128,250.

3 (Air Defense Command)

4 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York: One hun-
5 dred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

6 Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts: Two hundred units
7 of family housing, \$2,682,000.

8 Newcastle County Airport, Delaware: One hundred units
9 of family housing, \$1,341,000.

10 Truax Air Force Base, Wisconsin: One hundred units
11 of family housing, \$1,341,000.

12 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan: Ninety units of
13 family housing, \$1,206,900.

14 Paine Air Force Base, Washington: Seventy units of
15 family housing, \$938,700.

16 Oxnard Air Force Base, California: Seventy units of
17 family housing, \$938,700.

18 Ent Air Force Base, Colorado: Ninety units of family
19 housing, \$1,206,900.

20 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: Fifty units of
21 family housing, \$670,500.

22 Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pennsylvania: Fifty units
23 of family housing, \$670,500.

1 Niagara Municipal Airport, New York: Fifty units of
2 family housing, \$670,500.

3 Minneapolis-Saint Paul Airport, Minnesota: Seventy
4 units of family housing, \$938,700.

5 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota : One hundred units
6 of family housing, \$1,341,000.

7 Geiger Field, Washington: Fifty units of family housing,
8 \$670,500.

9 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: Fifty units of
10 family housing, \$670,500.

11 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: Fifty units of family
12 housing, \$670,500.

13 McGee-Tyson Airport, Tennessee: Fifty units of family
14 housing, \$670,500.

15 Portland International Airport, Oregon: Sixty units of
16 family housing, \$804,600.

17 Minot area, North Dakota: Sixty-five units of family
18 housing, \$871,650.

19 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan: Fifty units of
20 family housing, \$670,500.

21 (Tactical Air Command)

22 Clovis Air Force Base, New Mexico: One hundred and
23 seventy units of family housing, \$2,279,700.

24 Hurlburt Air Force Base, Florida: Two hundred and
25 seventy-five units of family housing, \$3,687,750.

1 Foster Air Force Base, Texas: Two hundred units of
2 family housing, \$2,682,000.

3 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey: Five units of
4 family housing, \$108,000.

5 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina: Five units of
6 family housing, \$108,000.

7 (Air Training Command)

8 Luke Air Force Base, Arizona: One hundred and
9 twenty-five units of family housing, \$1,676,250.

10 Laredo Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred units of
11 family housing, \$1,341,000.

12 Gary Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred units of
13 family housing, \$1,341,000.

14 Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and
15 fifty units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

16 Greenville Air Force Base, Mississippi: One hundred
17 and twenty units of family housing, \$1,609,200.

18 Moody Air Force Base, Georgia: One hundred and
19 forty units of family housing, \$1,877,400.

20 Stead Air Force Base, Nevada: Ninety units of family
21 housing, \$1,206,900.

22 McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas: One hundred and
23 fifty units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

24 Webb Air Force Base, Texas: Eighty-five units of
25 family housing, \$1,139,850.

1 Parks Air Force Base, California: Eighty-five units of
2 family housing, \$1,139,850.

3 (Military Air Transport Service)

4 Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina: Four hun-
5 dred and fifty units of family housing, \$6,034,500.

6 (Continental Air Command)

7 Beale Air Force Base, California: Two hundred and
8 twenty-five units of family housing, \$3,017,250.

9 (Research and Development Command)

10 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico: Five units of
11 family housing, \$108,000.

12 TITLE IV

13 SEC. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air
14 Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further
15 development of military, naval, and Air Force installations
16 and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act
17 without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and
18 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and
19 prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by
20 section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The
21 authority to provide family housing by the construction or
22 installation of public works shall include authority to acquire
23 lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including
24 the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange
25 of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

1 SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
2 not to exceed \$175,000,000 to carry out the purposes of titles
3 I, II, and III, and not to exceed \$15,000,000 to carry out
4 the purposes of section 408, of this Act.

5 SEC. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in
6 titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the
7 Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 per centum,
8 but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount
9 authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

10 SEC. 404. Not to exceed two hundred and fifty of the
11 units of family quarters constructed under the authority of
12 titles I, II, and III of this Act shall have a net floor area of
13 not to exceed two thousand and one hundred square feet.
14 None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed
15 by this Act shall have a net floor area in excess of one thou-
16 sand two hundred and fifty square feet, and the average net
17 floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed
18 one thousand and eighty square feet.

19 SEC. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose
20 of this Act shall be available for expenses incident to con-
21 struction or rehabilitation work authorized by this Act, in-
22 cluding administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

23 SEC. 406. Whenever—

24 (a) the President determines that compliance with
25 the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second

1 Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this
2 Act with respect to the establishment or development of
3 military installations and facilities in foreign countries
4 would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions
5 of this Act; and

6 (b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
7 General have agreed upon alternative methods for con-
8 ducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the Presi-
9 dent is authorized to exempt such contracts from the
10 requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Con-
11 gress.

12 SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to
13 procure family housing for military personnel in foreign
14 countries through the use of not to exceed the equivalent
15 of \$75,000,000 in foreign currencies in accordance with
16 the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and
17 Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third
18 Congress), which family housing shall be in addition to
19 family housing to be constructed or acquired by the De-
20 partment of Defense through the use of appropriated funds.
21 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secre-
22 tary of the military department concerned is authorized
23 to utilize and transfer to the Commodity Credit Corpo-
24 ration in lieu of reimbursement pursuant to section 105
25 of said Act the allowances for quarters that would other-

1 wise be payable to military personnel occupying such
2 family housing to the amount of the cost of the quarters
3 involved.

4 SEC. 408. The Secretaries of the military departments
5 are authorized to acquire a total of not to exceed five
6 thousand units of trailers which may be made available
7 at locations both inside and outside continental United
8 States for occupancy by military personnel and their de-
9 pendants on a rental basis without loss of any allowances
10 for quarters.

A BILL

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CASE

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

[Report No. 1994]

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. CASE) introduced the following bill:
which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

JULY 29 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Reported by MR. CASE, with an amendment

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in *italic*]

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized
5 further to develop military installations and facilities by
6 providing family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the construction or instal-
8 lation of public works, which include site preparation,
9 appurtenances, utilities, equipment and the acquisition
10 of land, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

1

2

(Third Army Area)

3

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Three hundred units of
family housing, \$4,093,000.

5

(Fourth Army Area)

6

Fort Bliss, Texas: Two hundred and fifty units of
family housing, \$3,213,000.

8

Fort Hood, Texas: Six hundred units of family housing,
\$8,099,000.

10

(Fifth Army Area)

11

Camp Carson, Colorado: One thousand units of family
housing, \$13,427,000.

13

Camp Crowder, Missouri: Seventy units of family
housing, \$952,000.

15

(Sixth Army Area)

16

Fort Lewis, Washington: Eight hundred units of family
housing, \$10,686,000.

18

Camp Cooke (United States Disciplinary Barracks),
California: Fifty units of family housing \$663,000.

20

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Twenty units of family
housing, \$267,000.

22

(Quartermaster Corps)

23

Belle Mead General Depot, New Jersey: Ten units of
family housing, \$158,000.

24

(Chemical Corps)

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Thirty units of family housing, \$486,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Two hundred units of family housing, \$2,899,000.

Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Virginia: Ten units of family housing, \$164,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Three hundred units of family housing, \$3,984,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Two hundred and fifty units of family housing, \$3,374,000.

Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, North Carolina: Four units of family housing, \$69,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Ten units of family housing, \$160,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Three units of family housing, \$79,000.

Killeen Base, Texas: Five units of family housing: \$99,000.

1 (Tactical Sites)

2 Various locations: Three hundred units of family hous-
3 ing, \$3,990,000.

4 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized fur-
5 ther to develop military installations and facilities by pro-
6 viding family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public
8 works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment,
9 in a total amount of \$12,230,550: *Provided*, That in his dis-
10 cretion the Secretary of the Army may utilize the authoriza-
11 tion contained in this section to provide family housing by
12 the construction or installation of public works, which include
13 site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and
14 acquisition of land, at locations to be determined by him.
15 Such family housing shall be in addition to, but shall not
16 exceed 5 per centum of, the total number of units authorized
17 by section 101 of this Act, but the average cost of such
18 additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

19 TITLE II

20 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized fur-
21 ther to develop naval installations and facilities by providing
22 family housing for personnel of the military departments and
23 their dependents by the construction or installation of public
24 works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utili-
25 ties, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(First Naval District)

Naval hospital, Newport, Rhode Island: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Third Naval District)

Naval hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Fourth Naval District)

Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Fifth Naval District)

Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Fifty units of family housing, \$642,500.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina: Thirty-five units of family housing, \$473,300.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Virginia (Skiffes Creek Annex): Five units of family housing, \$91,200.

(Sixth Naval District)

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Ninety units of family housing, \$1,192,200.

1 Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Thirty units of
2 family housing, \$397,300.

3. Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Twenty units of
4 family housing, \$273,900.

5 Naval station, Key West, Florida: Eighty units of
6 family housing, \$1,044,500.

7 Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City,
8 Florida: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$343,100.

9 Naval hospital, Pensacola, Florida: Twenty-five units of
10 family housing, \$321,300.

11 Naval supply corps school, Athens, Georgia: Thirty
12 units of family housing, \$456,000.

13 Naval auxiliary air station, Glynco, Georgia: Eighty
14 units of family housing, \$1,058,600.

15 Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Missis-
16 sippi: Seven units of family housing, \$102,100.

17 Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South Caro-
18 lina: One hundred and seventy-five units of family housing,
19 \$2,305,600.

20 Naval hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina: Fifty units
21 of family housing, \$654,300.

22 (Eighth Naval District)

23 Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Eighty
24 units of family housing, \$1,073,400.

1 (Eleventh Naval District)

2 Naval amphibious base, Coronado, California: Two units
3 of family housing, \$47,300.

4 Naval air station, Miramar, California: Fifteen units
5 of family housing, \$204,500.

6 Naval hospital, San Diego, California: Ten units of
7 family housing, \$152,000.

8 (Twelfth Naval District)

9 Naval hospital, Oakland, California: Ten units of family
10 housing, \$152,000.

11 Naval supply center, Oakland, California: Ten units of
12 family housing, \$152,000.

13 Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, California:
14 Fifty units of family housing, \$666,000.

15 Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Sixty units
16 of family housing, \$787,500.

17 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

18 Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Georgia: One
19 hundred units of family housing, \$1,339,800.

20 Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, California: One
21 unit of family housing, \$27,000.

22 Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California:
23 Twelve units of family housing, \$173,400.

1 Marine Corps school, Quantico, Virginia: Three hundred
2 units of family housing, \$4,121,700.

3 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

4 (Atlantic Ocean Area)

5 Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Forty-five
6 units of family housing, \$595,100.

7 Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: One hundred units
8 of family housing, \$1,379,000.

9 (Pacific Ocean Area)

10 Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: One hun-
11 dred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$2,289,100.

12 Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Ha-
13 waii: Two units of family housing, \$30,400.

14 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized fur-
15 ther to develop naval installations and facilities by providing
16 family housing for personnel of the military departments and
17 their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which
18 include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total
19 amount of \$1,218,300: *Provided*, That in his discretion the
20 Secretary of the Navy may utilize the authorization contained
21 in this section to provide family housing by the construction
22 or installation of public works, which include site prepara-
23 tion, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and acquisition of
24 land, at locations to be determined by him. Such family
25 housing shall be in addition to, but shall not exceed 5 per

centum of, the total number of units authorized by section 201 of this Act, but the average cost of such additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Strategic Air Command)

Sedalia Air Force Base, Missouri: Four hundred units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma: Three hundred and sixty units of family housing, \$4,827,600.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebraska: Four hundred units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kansas: Two hundred and eighty units of family housing, \$3,754,800.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine: Three hundred units of family housing, \$4,023,000.

1 Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana: Two hundred
2 units of family housing, \$2,682,000.

3 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona: Five units of
4 family housing, \$108,000.

5 Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of
6 family housing, \$108,000.

7 Great Falls Air Force Base, Montana: Four units of
8 family housing, \$87,750.

9 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia: Five units of family
10 housing, \$108,000.

11 Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi: Thirty units of
12 family housing, \$402,300.

13 Larson Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of
14 family housing, \$108,000.

15 Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: Four units of family
16 housing, \$87,750.

17 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: Four units of family
18 housing, \$87,750.

19 Mather Air Force Base, California: Four units of family
20 housing \$87,750.

21 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: Four units of
22 family housing, \$81,000.

23 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: Five units of family
24 housing, \$108,000.

1 Travis Air Force Base, California: Six units of family
2 housing, \$128,250.

3 (Air Defense Command)

4 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York: One hun-
5 dred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

6 Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts: Two hundred units
7 of family housing, \$2,682,000.

8 Newcastle County Airport, Delaware: One hundred units
9 of family housing, \$1,341,000.

10 Truax Air Force Base, Wisconsin: One hundred units
11 of family housing, \$1,341,000.

12 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan: Ninety units of
13 family housing, \$1,206,900.

14 Paine Air Force Base, Washington: Seventy units of
15 family housing, \$938,700.

16 Oxnard Air Force Base, California: Seventy units of
17 family housing, \$938,700.

18 Ent Air Force Base, Colorado: Ninety units of family
19 housing, \$1,206,900.

20 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: Fifty units of
21 family housing, \$670,500.

22 Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pennsylvania: Fifty units
23 of family housing, \$670,500.

1 Niagara Municipal Airport, New York: Fifty units of
2 family housing, \$670,500.

3 Minneapolis-Saint Paul Airport, Minnesota: Seventy
4 units of family housing, \$938,700.

5 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota: One hundred units
6 of family housing, \$1,341,000.

7 Geiger Field, Washington: Fifty units of family housing,
8 \$670,500.

9 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: Fifty units of
10 family housing, \$670,500.

11 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: Fifty units of family
12 housing, \$670,500.

13 McGee-Tyson Airport, Tennessee: Fifty units of family
14 housing, \$670,500.

15 Portland International Airport, Oregon: Sixty units of
16 family housing, \$804,600.

17 Minot area, North Dakota: Sixty-five units of family
18 housing, \$871,650.

19 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan: Fifty units of
20 family housing, \$670,500.

21 (Tactical Air Command)

22 Clovis Air Force Base, New Mexico: One hundred and
23 seventy units of family housing, \$2,279,700.

24 Hurlburt Air Force Base, Florida: Two hundred and
25 seventy-five units of family housing, \$3,687,750.

1 Foster Air Force Base, Texas: Two hundred units of
2 family housing, \$2,682,000.

3 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey: Five units of
4 family housing, \$108,000.

5 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina: Five units of
6 family housing, \$108,000.

7 (Air Training Command)

8 Luke Air Force Base, Arizona: One hundred and
9 twenty-five units of family housing, \$1,676,250.

10 Laredo Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred units of
11 family housing, \$1,341,000.

12 Gary Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred units of
13 family housing, \$1,341,000.

14 Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and
15 fifty units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

16 Greenville Air Force Base, Mississippi: One hundred
17 and twenty units of family housing, \$1,609,200.

18 Moody Air Force Base, Georgia: One hundred and
19 forty units of family housing, \$1,877,400.

20 Stead Air Force Base, Nevada: Ninety units of family
21 housing, \$1,206,900.

22 McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas: One hundred and
23 fifty units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

24 Webb Air Force Base, Texas: Eighty-five units of
25 family housing, \$1,139,850.

1 Parks Air Force Base, California: Eighty-five units of
2 family housing, \$1,139,850.

3 (Military Air Transport Service)

4 Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina: Four hun-
5 dred and fifty units of family housing, \$6,034,500.

6 (Continental Air Command)

7 Beale Air Force Base, California: Two hundred and
8 twenty-five units of family housing, \$3,017,250.

9 (Research and Development Command)

10 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico: Five units of
11 family housing, \$108,000.

12 TITLE IV

13 SEC. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air
14 Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further
15 development of military, naval, and Air Force installations
16 and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act
17 without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and
18 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and
19 prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by
20 section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The
21 authority to provide family housing by the construction or
22 installation of public works shall include authority to acquire
23 lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including
24 the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange
25 of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

1 SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated
2 not to exceed \$175,000,000 to carry out the purposes of titles
3 I, II, and III, and not to exceed \$15,000,000 to carry out
4 the purposes of section 408, of this Act.

5 SEC. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in
6 titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the
7 Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 per centum,
8 but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount
9 authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

10 SEC. 404. Not to exceed two hundred and fifty of the
11 units of family quarters constructed under the authority of
12 titles I, II, and III of this Act shall have a net floor area of
13 not to exceed two thousand and one hundred square feet.
14 None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed
15 by this Act shall have a net floor area in excess of one thou-
16 sand two hundred and fifty square feet, and the average net
17 floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed
18 one thousand and eighty square feet.

19 SEC. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose
20 of this Act shall be available for expenses incident to con-
21 struction or rehabilitation work authorized by this Act, in-
22 cluding administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

23 SEC. 406. Whenever—

24 (a) the President determines that compliance with
25 the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second

1 Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this
2 Act with respect to the establishment or development of
3 military installations and facilities in foreign countries
4 would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions
5 of this Act; and

6 (b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
7 General have agreed upon alternative methods for con-
8 ducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the Presi-
9 dent is authorized to exempt such contracts from the
10 requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Con-
11 gress.

12 ~~SEC. 407.~~ The Secretary of Defense is authorized to
13 procure family housing for military personnel in foreign
14 countries through the use of not to exceed the equivalent
15 of \$75,000,000 in foreign currencies in accordance with
16 the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and
17 Assistance Act of 1954 (~~Public Law 480, Eighty-third~~
18 ~~Congress~~), which family housing shall be in addition to
19 family housing to be constructed or acquired by the De-
20 partment of Defense through the use of appropriated funds.
21 Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secre-
22 tary of the military department concerned is authorized
23 to utilize and transfer to the Commodity Credit Corpo-
24 ration in lieu of reimbursement pursuant to section 105
25 of said Act the allowances for quarters that would other-

1 wise be payable to military personnel occupying such
2 family housing to the amount of the cost of the quarters
3 involved.

4 *SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, sub-*
5 *ject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the*
6 *Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family*
7 *housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to*
8 *be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in*
9 *foreign countries, to the value of \$75,000,000 through the*
10 *use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of*
11 *the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of*
12 *1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress).*

13 *The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees*
14 *on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Represent-*
15 *atives a quarterly report, the first of which shall be submitted*
16 *three months subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act,*
17 *setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units*
18 *constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in*
19 *this section during the three-month period preceding the date*
20 *of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location*
21 *of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired*
22 *pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.*

23 *Appropriations of the Department of Defense otherwise*
24 *available for payment of quarters allowances of personnel*
25 *occupying such family housing shall be available for reim-*

1 *bursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to*
2 *section 105 of the Agricultural Trade Development and*
3 *Assistance Act of 1954 in an amount equivalent to the dollar*
4 *value of the currencies used.*

5 SEC. 408. The Secretaries of the military departments
6 are authorized to acquire a total of not to exceed five
7 thousand units of trailers which may be made available
8 at locations both inside and outside continental United
9 States for occupancy by military personnel and their de-
10 pendants on a rental basis without loss of any allowances
11 for quarters.

[Report No. 1994]

A BILL

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. CASE

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

JULY 29 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Reported with an amendment

AUTHORIZATION FOR FAMILY QUARTERS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

JULY 29 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 3818]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3818) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, having considered the same report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENT TO THE BILL

Amend the bill as follows:

Beginning with line 12, on page 16, strike out down through line 3, page 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, to the value of \$75,000,000 through the use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress).

The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a quarterly report, the first of which shall be submitted three months subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the three month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.

Appropriations of the Department of Defense otherwise available for payment of quarters allowances of personnel occupying such family housing shall be available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to section 105 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The principal purpose of S. 3818 is to authorize, the military departments to construct 11,967 units of family quarters for military personnel. Secondary purposes are (1) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to procure family housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), and (2) to authorize the acquisition of 5,000 house trailers for availability to military personnel on a rental basis without loss of quarters allowances.

GENERAL COMMENT ON MILITARY HOUSING

To the extent that adequate Government-owned quarters are available, military personnel are assigned occupancy thereof and no quarters allowances are paid to the personnel who occupy these quarters. Those military personnel who are not assigned public quarters receive a monetary allowance for quarters at rates prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended. The Government-owned quarters now in existence have been constructed with appropriated funds, but although several billions of dollars have been authorized and appropriated for military construction since the end of World War II, an insignificant portion of this construction has been for family quarters. Over the past 4 years only 807 units of family housing have been built in the United States with appropriated funds. The failure to provide adequate housing for military personnel has probably been one of the contributing causes of a reduction in reenlistment rates, with consequential loss of trained personnel and expense of training replacements. Moreover, the nonavailability of public quarters has necessitated the appropriation of large sums for quarters allowances. Appropriations for quarters allowances for fiscal year 1954 were in excess of \$1.3 billions. The housing units that will be constructed under the authority granted by this bill will mean that no quarters allowances will be required in future years for the personnel occupying these units.

It should be noted that the construction and availability of family quarters do not constitute a new monetary benefit to military personnel; instead of providing quarters allowances the Government will provide housing in kind, with a resultant savings of quarters allowances.

CRITERIA FOR ESTIMATING REQUIREMENTS

It is obvious that the military departments have used conservative criteria in estimating requirements for family quarters. The permanent peacetime strength of the Armed Forces has been assumed to be 1,750,000, which figure is slightly more than one-half of the present actual strength. Approximately 10 percent of the 1,750,000 are officers and approximately 90 percent are enlisted men. Approximately 80 percent of the officers and 20 percent of the enlisted men are estimated to be married and to require family quarters for the purpose of this calculation, which results in a requirement of 140,000 units for officers and 315,000 units for enlisted men, a total of 455,000 units.

Against this total there are now available 37,000 permanent public quarters, 25,000 temporary public quarters in satisfactory condition,

and 87,000 Wherry units that are completed or in process of completion. The total availability of 149,000 units when matched against the total requirement of 455,000 units reflects a deficit of 306,000 units. It has been estimated that 150,000 privately owned housing units are available in local communities. Thus the net deficit is at least 150,000 units.

WHERRY HOUSING

In response to questions from the committee of why title VIII of the National Housing Act (the so-called Wherry Act) could not be utilized to meet the deficit, the Department of Defense has furnished the following statement:

It is doubtful if the Wherry method will satisfy any material part of the need. On June 3, 1953, Congress amended the Federal Housing Act to require certification by sponsors as to actual cost and further required that if such cost was less than the amount of the mortgage that the difference be paid to the mortgagee as a reduction of the principal of the mortgage. Since that date only 2,690 units have been put under contract. It is also to be observed that in the month preceding the effective date of the above amendment there were 8,840 units put under contract. It is, therefore, our opinion that except to a minor degree, the Wherry Act cannot be relied upon to meet the deficiency.

Furthermore, by law, Wherry housing is restricted to installations certified as permanent and the services have substantial requirements at installations not so certified; also the average size of Wherry units is less than 900 square feet, which is insufficient for families with several children.

A most important objection to Wherry housing is its higher ultimate cost to the Government than housing built by appropriated funds. Wherry housing is erected upon federally owned land, leased to the sponsor for a firm term of 75 years with a right of recapture in the Government after 50 years. Over that 50-year period the Government must pay quarters allowances to the occupants. These allowances average \$90 per month or \$1,080 per year. Over a 50-year period, therefore, the cost to the Government is \$54,000. If the housing is built by appropriated funds, the total cost to the Government consists of the original cost of the house, \$13,500 and the cost of maintenance and provision of utilities which is conservatively estimated to be not more than \$346 per year or \$17,300 for the period. This total cost to the Government is \$30,800 which is \$23,200 less per unit than under the Wherry Act. If simple interest is computed on these various payments the savings under the appropriated funds method will increase to \$31,000.

Furthermore, the housing provided by appropriated funds would average 1,000 square feet per unit as compared with less than 900 square feet per unit of existing Wherry housing. The housing so constructed would be more livable, better built, and more easily maintained. Better control of military personnel would be obtained; personnel required in cases of emergency would be immediately available. Service morale would be improved and the rate of reenlistments should increase. During the past 4 years only 807 units have been built by appropriated funds, in the United States.

Comparative construction costs

By law FHA insurance on Wherry mortgages is restricted to 90 percent of the replacement cost as estimated by FHA, with a further proviso that the maximum mortgage shall not exceed \$8,100 per unit for multiple-type construction and \$9,000 for single dwellings. If we assume that the average cost of a Wherry unit is \$8,100, we must nevertheless add the cost of Government contribution as provided for under section 505, Public Law 155, 82d Congress. For the projects for which such expenditures have been necessary, the average cost has been \$750 per unit, making the actual cost of Wherry approximately \$8,850.

The present bill provides a limitation that the average cost shall not exceed \$13,500. This difference of \$4,650 is explained approximately as follows:

(a) For 11 percent larger size	\$960
(b) For 15 percent better quality	1, 310
(c) For lower costs on larger projects	875

(Only $\frac{1}{6}$ of the existing Wherry projects consist of less than 100 units, whereas $\frac{1}{6}$ of the housing provided by the proposed bill would be for less than 100 units).

4 FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

- (d) For higher costs incident to construction by Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Yards and Docks, whose integrity is unquestioned, due...\$1,490
- (1) To compliance with Davis-Bacon Act, requiring payment of prevailing wages and adherence to working conditions on federally constructed projects; (2) to more detailed specifications; (3) to requirement of performance bonds; (4) to closer inspection.

Total..... 4,635
(Under this method open competitive bid is required, which is desirable.)

SIZE AND COST OF UNITS TO BE CONSTRUCTED

The type and cost of housing provided under this authorization will be subject to promulgation of detailed specifications by the Secretary of Defense. One-, two-, three-, and four-bedroom houses will be provided. Housing constructed for enlisted men will average 952 square feet in area and \$12,850 in cost; housing for company grade officers will average 1,126 square feet in area and \$15,200 in cost; housing for field grade officers will average 1,500 square feet in area and \$20,250 in cost; and housing for officers in flag and general rank will average 2,000 square feet in area and \$27,000 in cost.

Since the average cost of all housing to be constructed under the authorization contained in this bill will be \$13,500, it is manifest that the great preponderance of the housing to be constructed is for enlisted men and company grade officers.

Section 504 of Public Law 534, 83d Congress, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1955 limits the floor area of family quarters to 1,250 square feet, with an average net floor area of all family quarters not to exceed 1,080 square feet. Section 404 of Public Law 534, 83d Congress, authorizes the construction of not to exceed 250 units of family quarters with a net floor area of not to exceed 2,100 square feet. All other units authorized by this bill are limited to a net floor area of not to exceed 1,250 square feet, with an average net floor area of not to exceed 1,080 square feet.

ORIGIN OF THE BILL

When the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1955, which has become Public Law 534, 83d Congress, was pending before the House Committee on Armed Services, the Department of Defense requested an amendment to the bill that would have added \$350 million in authorization for the construction of military family housing. The House Committee on Armed Services decided to consider the family-housing authorization separately, and Public Law 534, 83d Congress, does not contain authorization for family housing. Subsequently the House Committee on Armed Services conducted hearings on the housing authorization and reported H. R. 9924. The line items comprising H. R. 9924, as it was reported by the House Armed Services Committee, total some \$216 million, but an appropriation of not to exceed \$175 million was recommended to carry out the purposes of the bill.

The committee is of the opinion that the appropriations authorization should correspond to the total of the line items in the bill. The committee conducted hearings on the text of H. R. 9924 and after making the reductions and deletions necessary to cause the line items to total \$175 million, the bill was introduced in the Senate as S. 3818.

PROCUREMENT OF FAMILY HOUSING THROUGH USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Section 407 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to procure family housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies, in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.). The extent of this authority is limited to the equivalent of \$75 million in foreign currencies.

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 authorizes the President to negotiate agreements with friendly nations for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities in exchange for foreign currencies. Section 104 of the act prescribes the purposes for which the President may use the foreign currencies that accrue to the United States from the sale of surplus commodities. Section 105 of the act provides that "any department or agency of the Government using any of such currencies for a purpose for which funds have been appropriated shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used."

In order that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be unfairly charged with the cost of military housing, section 407 of this bill provides that appropriations otherwise available for payment of quarters allowances of personnel occupying family housing acquired pursuant to this authority shall be available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used.

The committee has amended section 407 by adding a provision that the utilization of the authority for the procurement of family housing overseas shall be subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by adding a provision that the Committees on Armed Services shall be furnished quarterly reports of the housing procured pursuant to the authority contained in this section.

PROCUREMENT OF TRAILERS

Section 408 of the bill authorizes the Secretaries of the military departments to acquire a total of not to exceed 5,000 units of trailers to be made available for occupancy by military personnel and their dependents on a rental basis without loss of any allowances for quarters.

The committee has been sufficiently impressed by recent refinements in trailers to believe that they would serve a useful purpose in some locations where it is inadvisable to construct or otherwise to procure housing for military personnel. Trailers probably do not constitute housing that is sufficiently adequate to require the personnel occupying them to forfeit the entire amount of quarters allowances, and it is contemplated that the rentals charged for the use of these trailers will be somewhat less than the quarters allowances accruing to the personnel occupying them. The rentals received will be covered into the Treasury under "Miscellaneous receipts."

COST DATA

This bill would authorize the appropriation of \$175 million for the construction of 11,967 units of family quarters and of \$15 million for the procurement of 5,000 trailers. In the communication from the

President of the United States transmitting the proposed supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense public works construction, House Document 408, 83d Congress, 2d session, it was recommended that not to exceed \$175 million of unexpended balances of public-works appropriations be made available to fund this family-housing authorization.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

The housing authorization contained in this bill is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 83d Congress, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, as is evidenced by the letter set forth below that requested an authorization of \$350 million for this purpose in the form of an amendment to the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1955.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
LEGISLATIVE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1954.

HON. DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to H. R. 8726, a bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes, now pending before your committee.

During the testimony before your committee on that bill, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Properties and Installations stated that the Department of Defense intended in the near future to request authorization for the construction of family housing in a considerable amount for personnel of the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense now requests such an authorization in the form of an amendment to H. R. 8726 which would increase the authorization for public works in that bill by \$350 million.

Historically, the military departments have provided family housing for their personnel through direct appropriations for that purpose. During the past several years, however, the amount of family housing authorized in public works authorization bills has been insignificant in comparison with the needs of the Department of Defense. This is true also in the case of H. R. 8726 in its present form.

The Department of Defense has been able to satisfy a portion of those needs through the use of title VIII of the National Housing Act (known as the Wherry Act) and other temporary provisions contained in titles III and IX of that act. Sixty-four thousand three hundred and eighty units of Wherry housing have already been constructed, 13,611 are in the process of construction, and commitments have been made by the Federal Housing Administration for 1,283 additional units.

The Wherry Act has made a significant contribution toward alleviating the family-housing problem of the Department of Defense. For that reason, the Department of Defense favors a year's extension of the Wherry Act, which will expire on June 30 of this year unless further extended by the Congress. However, this Department believes that its housing problem can be solved only if substantial funds are authorized and appropriated by the Congress for the direct construction and rehabilitation of family housing.

This amendment would authorize the appropriation of \$350 million for that purpose. It is estimated that that amount will enable the Department of Defense to provide approximately 25,000 new units of family housing at an estimated average cost of \$13,500 and to rehabilitate other existing units of family housing.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this amendment to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDKE
(For the Assistant Secretary).

FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS 7

List by States of family quarters authorizations

Arizona-----	\$4, 950, 250
Army:	
Fort Huachuca, 200 units-----	2, 899, 000
Yuma Test Station, 20 units-----	267, 000
Air Force:	
Davis Monthan AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
Luke AFB, 125 units-----	1, 676, 250
	<hr/>
California-----	7, 709, 000
Army:	
Camp Cooke, 50 units-----	663, 000
Two Rock Ranch Station, 10 units-----	160, 000
Navy:	
Naval hospital, San Diego, 10 units-----	152, 000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, 12 units-----	173, 400
Naval Communication Station, Skaggs Island, 50 units---	666, 000
Naval Air Station, Miramar, 15 units-----	204, 500
Marine Corps Supply Annex, Barstow, 1 unit-----	27, 000
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, 2 units-----	47, 300
Naval Supply Center, Oakland, 10 units-----	152, 000
Naval Hospital, Oakland, 10 units-----	152, 000
Air Force:	
Beale AFB, 225 units-----	3, 017, 250
Mather AFB, 4 units-----	87, 750
Oxnard AFB, 70 units-----	938, 700
Parks AFB, 85 units-----	1, 139, 850
Travis AFB, 6 units-----	128, 250
	<hr/>
Colorado-----	14, 633, 900
Army: Camp Carson, 1,000 units-----	13, 427, 000
Air Force: Ent AFB, 90 units-----	1, 206, 900
	<hr/>
Delaware: Air Force: New Castle County Airport, 100 units-----	1, 341, 000
	<hr/>
Florida-----	7, 260, 050
Navy:	
Naval Hospital, Pensacola, 25 units-----	321, 300
Naval Air Station, Key West, 20 units-----	273, 900
Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, 30 units-----	397, 300
Naval Mine Countermeasures Station, Panama City, 25 units-----	343, 100
Naval Station, Key West, 80 units-----	1, 044, 500
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, 90 units-----	1, 192, 200
Air Force: Hurlburt AFB, 275 units-----	3, 687, 750
	<hr/>
Georgia-----	4, 839, 800
Navy:	
Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Albany, 100 units-----	1, 339, 800
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Glyneo, 80 units-----	1, 058, 600
Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, 30 units-----	456, 000
Air Force:	
Hunter AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
Moody AFB, 140 units-----	1, 877, 400
	<hr/>
Idaho: Air Force: Mountain Home AFB, 4 units-----	81, 000
Iowa: Air Force: Sioux City Municipal Airport, 50 units-----	670, 500
	<hr/>

8 FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

List by States of family quarters authorizations—Continued

Kansas-----	\$5, 766, 300
Air Force:	
McConnell AFB, 150 units-----	2, 011, 500
Smoky Hill AFB, 280 units-----	3, 754, 800
Kentucky: Army: Fort Campbell, 300 units-----	4, 093, 000
Louisiana: Air Force: Lake Charles AFB, 200 units-----	2, 682, 000
Maine-----	4, 781, 250
Air Force:	
Dow AFB, 300 units-----	4, 023, 000
Limestone AFB, 4 units-----	87, 750
Presque Isle AFB, 50 units-----	670, 500
Massachusetts: Air Force: Otis AFB, 200 units-----	2, 682, 000
Michigan-----	1, 877, 400
Air Force:	
Kinross AFB, 90 units-----	1, 206, 900
Wurtsmith AFB, 50 units-----	670, 500
Minnesota-----	2, 279, 700
Air Force:	
Duluth Municipal Airport, 100 units-----	1, 341, 000
Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport, 70 units-----	938, 700
Mississippi-----	2, 113, 600
Navy: Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, 7 units--	102, 100
Air Force:	
Greenville AFB, 120 units-----	1, 609, 200
Columbus AFB, 30 units-----	402, 300
Missouri-----	6, 316, 000
Army: Camp Crowder, 70 units-----	952, 000
Air Force: Sedalia AFB, 400 units-----	5, 364, 000
Montana: Air Force: Great Falls AFB, 4 units-----	87, 750
Nebraska: Air Force: Lincoln AFB, 400 units-----	5, 364, 000
Nevada-----	2, 102, 400
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, 60 units-----	787, 500
Air Force:	
Nellis AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
Stead AFB, 90 units-----	1, 206, 900
New Jersey-----	266, 000
Army: Belle Mead General Depot, 10 units-----	158, 000
Air Force: McGuire AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
New Mexico-----	2, 466, 700
Army: Sandia Base, 3 units-----	79, 000
Air Force:	
Clovis AFB, 170 units-----	2, 279, 700
Kirtland AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000

FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS 9

List by States of family quarters authorizations—Continued

New York	\$2, 163, 500
Navy: Naval Hospit 1, St. Albans, 10 units	152, 000
Air Force:	
Niagara Municipal Airport, 50 units	670, 500
Suffolk County AFB, 100 units	1, 341, 000
North Carolina	1, 184, 800
Army: Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, 4 units	69, 000
Navy:	
Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, 50 units	642, 500
Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, 35 units	473, 300
North Dakota: Air Force: Minot, 65 units	871, 650
Ohio	758, 250
Air Force:	
Lockbourne AFB, 4 units	87, 750
Youngstown Municipal Airport, 50 units	670, 500
Oklahoma: Air Force: Altus AFB, 360 units	4, 827, 600
Oregon: Air Force: Portland International Airport, 60 units	804, 600
Pennsylvania	1, 143, 800
Navy:	
Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, 25 units	321, 300
Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, 10 units	152, 000
Air Force: Greater Pittsburgh Airport, 50 units	670, 500
Rhode Island: Navy: Naval Hospital, Newport, 10 units	152, 000
South Carolina	9, 102, 400
Navy:	
Naval Hospital, Beaufort, 50 units	654, 300
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, 175 units	2, 305, 600
Air Force:	
Charleston AFB, 450 units	6, 034, 500
Shaw AFB, 5 units	108, 000
Tennessee: Air Force: McGee-Tyson Airport, 50 units	670, 500
Texas	20, 999, 750
Army:	
Fort Hood, 600 units	8, 099, 000
Fort Bliss, 250 units	3, 213, 000
Killeen Base, 5 units	99, 000
Navy: Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, 80 units	1, 073, 400
Air Force:	
Gary AFB, 100 units	1, 341, 000
Foster AFB, 200 units	2, 682, 000
Laredo AFB, 100 units	1, 341, 000
Laughlin AFB, 150 units	2, 011, 500
Webb AFB, 85 units	1, 139, 850
Utah: Army: Dugway Proving Ground, 30 units	486, 000

10 FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

List by States of family quarters authorizations—Continued

Virginia-----	\$11, 886, 900
Army:	
Department of the Army Transmitting Station, 10 units--	164, 000
Fort Belvoir, 300 units-----	3, 984, 000
Fort Eustis, 250 units-----	3, 374, 000
Navy:	
Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, 5 units-----	91, 200
Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, 10 units-----	152, 000
Marine Corps School, Quantico, 300 units-----	4, 121, 700
Washington-----	12, 511, 200
Army: Fort Lewis, 800 units-----	10, 686, 000
Air Force:	
Fairchild AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
Larson AFB, 5 units-----	108, 000
Paine AFB, 70 units-----	938, 700
Geiger Field, 50 units-----	670, 500
Wisconsin: Air Force: Truax AFB, 100 units-----	1, 341, 000
Various locations: Army: 300 units-----	3, 990, 000
Outside continental United States-----	4, 293, 600
Navy:	
Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, 100 units-----	1, 379, 000
Marine Corps Barracks, Pearl Harbor, 2 units-----	3, 400
Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands, 175 units-----	2, 289, 100
Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland, 45 units-----	595, 100



nection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as added to that act by section 805 (3) of the bill, insert after the words "San Diego County" the words "or Imperial County."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix a brief summary review of the Housing Act of 1954, H. R. 7839.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

DISCHARGE RULE

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry is with reference to paragraph 908 of the rules of the House relative to a motion to discharge a committee. My question is, Is it possible during the last 6 days of the session after a motion to recess or adjourn sine die has been adopted by both Houses, to call up the bill H. R. 9245, the postal-pay bill, under the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER. In response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman, the Chair invites attention to the second paragraph of clause 4 of rule XXVII, which contains the following statement:

On the second and fourth Mondays of each month, except during the last 6 days of any session of Congress, immediately after the approval of the Journal, any Member who has signed a motion to discharge which has been on the calendar at least 7 days prior thereto, and seeks recognition, shall be recognized for the purpose of calling it up.

It seems perfectly clear to the Chair that the meaning of the rule is that when a motion has been on the calendar 7 legislative days a Member who signed the motion can call it up on the second or the fourth Monday, except when the second or fourth Monday comes during the last 6 days of a session. The exception then means that during the last 6 days of a session the motion cannot be called up at all.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDING MINERAL LEASING LAWS

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3344) to amend the mineral leasing laws

to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1954.)

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAMILY HOUSING FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 662 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Michigan to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this a privileged resolution from the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It deals with the matter of military housing.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is against this rule which provides for 13,613 units of military housing for the personnel in the military services. The purpose, of course, is to provide adequate housing for the military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 662 which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military

departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 662 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. I do not know of anyone that is opposed to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9924 would authorize the military departments to provide family housing for personnel of the Armed Forces by the construction of 13,613 units, including replacement of substandard housing, and the rehabilitation of additional units, but at a total cost of not to exceed \$175 million.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been introduced as a partial answer to the pressing problem of providing adequate family quarters for our military personnel. We all know that in this day and age when the world situation is so uncertain that it is extremely important that our country have an adequately trained and competent corps of military personnel.

The housing arrangements for the military have been so poor in recent years, due to the lack of quarters and the inability of finding outside family quarters, that the reenlistment rates have declined considerably. This, I think all Members of the House will agree, is an extremely dangerous situation.

Since the Armed Forces have been unable in recent years to provide the necessary housing for our military personnel through housing constructed with appropriated funds, the recent alternative has been the granting of a monetary allowance for quarters to be secured individually by the military personnel as best they can.

The drawbacks to this solution of the housing problem are obvious when you consider the usual crowded conditions that exist near any military installation.

While H. R. 9924 would provide for less than 10 percent of the family housing needs of the Armed Forces, even on the present understrength condition of the military forces, still this bill proposes to start solving the problem on a permanent and effective basis. The report stresses the fact that the original investment made by the Government to provide housing for military personnel will be amortized over a period of 14 years due to the fact that no housing allowance will have to be made for each family occupying these housing units.

Mr. Speaker, this problem has to be solved in some way or other and there is no time to be lost in working out the answer. I hope that the House membership will see fit to adopt this rule and that the House will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman said he knew of no one opposed to the rule. I am very much in opposition to the bill in its present form. I hope it will be recommitted, and I would be very willing to vote against the rule to attain that end.

I would like to have time to explain my point.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are some people on this side who object to the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I said that I knew of none; now I know differently.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to reiterate the statement made by my colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I also am opposed to the bill. I trust it will be recommitted. I think it is a very poor method of financing and I would vote against the rule in order to attain that purpose.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that this rule will be adopted. After the observations that have just been made, the matter can be debated fully after we adopt the rule. It is an open one. All members will have an opportunity to speak on it. I reiterate that we should adopt the rule, and then the matter will be open for full discussion.

The bill provides for 13,613 units for the military, chiefly for the enlisted personnel. In my opinion, this will stimulate the enlistment of people in the armed services as well as be of great value in connection with reenlistments. I cannot conceive of anything that would retard enlistment and reenlistment in the military more than inadequate housing for those we are striving to get and to keep in the service. I should mention especially that every time there is a voluntary enlistment and reenlistment it means that many less to be drafted. Personally, I believe we should make things as satisfactory as we can for those who want to voluntarily enlist or reenlist, which, as I say, would automatically lessen the necessity for the draft.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. One of the worst things that the Congress has to contend with is this continual demand of the Military Establishment to place additional housing in places where they are not needed. I am afraid from my examination of this bill that is just what it does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I made a considerable study of this matter after the bill was reported from the Committee on Armed Services and I find that the amount of money involved is not nearly as great as might appear from the bill itself. For instance, when the military personnel is quartered in congested areas they are granted, in some cases, additional monetary consideration to rent quarters. In cities like Detroit and other large areas where there is congestion it is most difficult at times for the enlisted personnel, the sergeants and corporals, to rent quarters. This becomes important when the Government must give them additional money to rent quarters. Where there is adequate housing on the post itself they do not have

to give the personnel this additional monetary consideration.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman from Illinois has brought out the question of reenlistments. If we do not make the services attractive reenlistmentwise, insofar as officers are concerned, we will lose all of those skilled people from the military services and in the long run it will cost us millions of dollars more in order to try to make the services more attractive so that the officer personnel will not resign and so that the enlisted personnel, particularly in the first three grades, the very backbone of the military services, will not resign. If we do not make it attractive they will not reenlist. That is exactly the problem we are up against today.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his observation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say that I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Maryland who just spoke. The general has had much experience in connection with the military.

May I call attention to the fact that just last week the Committee on Armed Services of the House brought in a bill which passed scarcely without any objection whatsoever in order to give enlisted military personnel an opportunity to reenlist. The same thing is true of the officer personnel. In all of the services they have been denied too many of the comforts of life because we have been too penurious with them. This is one way of retaining both qualified officer personnel and enlisted personnel. I know myself, Mr. Speaker, in conversations with officers of different branches, in the service and in the reserve, that they are trying to get out as quickly as they can because of living conditions and other matters of that sort. In the long run this bill would save money.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We had exhaustive hearings before we brought this bill to the floor of the House. The housing conditions for our enlisted men and the junior officers are deplorable. This is only a stopgap piece of legislation that will provide for but 10 percent of the housing requirements in the military service. I certainly hope that the House will give us a chance to prove our case and not shut us off by refusing a rule.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. In every appropriation bill for the military there are items for millions and millions of dollars for quarters allowance that we are going to pay

out. I do not care what anybody on this floor says, we have got to appropriate it, and we have appropriated it under the law. The Committee on Appropriations does it every day. This bill is going to remove the necessity of going off of the bases and looking for housing, which we pay for day in and day out. This is trying to obviate the skinning of these people and causing them to pay these very exorbitant prices. This is an orderly approach to stop this spending which we are doing every year and which runs up into the untold millions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think, if I may be permitted to say so, that there are certain things about this bill that should be known. First, we need this housing; we cannot get it any other way. That was demonstrated in the testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. This bill does not interfere with Wherry housing. This bill does not interfere with private housing. This bill provides that these houses shall be built on or near installations where they do not have and cannot get the proper kind of housing. Also, when you study this bill, you will find in the long run it will save the Government money. It is true that it will require some appropriations, whereas in the housing built under Wherry housing or under private housing, appropriations might not be needed at this time. But, under Wherry housing the Defense Department or the Government through the Defense Department pays the rent through the living quarters allowances to the officers and personnel. Under the Government-owned housing, this money is saved because it is paid right back into the Government and eventually it becomes self-liquidating. The Government owns the housing, whereas under private housing it never does. It just pays the rent. This bill is necessary now for the defense and security of our country and for the morale of our troops.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

I wish to state further, Mr. Speaker, that undoubtedly from what has been mentioned here today this could come under the Wherry Act but I believe that all will admit that when these homes are built on these bases and airfields under these provisions, and built under the supervision of the engineers, they will be much better homes, more permanent type homes. I believe all will admit that under the Wherry Act, the homes that were built are not of the most permanent kind.

I believe it is important to make this observation, and it has to do with the financial consideration. We have now tens of thousands of young veterans in the service who, when they come back, will have the privilege of going to college under the GI bill of rights. That is a costly proposition. If we can keep those youngsters who are entitled, if they leave the service, to go to college under the GI bill of rights, if we can

make it attractive for them to stay in the service by giving them better housing and other more attractive conditions, it will lessen the cost of the GI bill of rights.

So when we consider the figures, we should consider that factor, along with the factor of having to pay \$80 or \$100 or \$120 for quarters off the base, in congested areas. Taking all those factors into consideration, I would say that the amount involved in this bill is very small.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the majority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, just the other day this House passed a reenlistment bonus bill which had for its purpose keeping trained personnel in the armed services. The Congress has done one thing after another in an effort to keep the right type of individuals in the service. The proposed measure here may be looked upon as just another one of the fringe benefits that we are offering in order to keep the right type of individuals in the various branches of our armed services. In the long run it will cost the Government nothing, but it will be another step in the right direction to take care of the personnel in the armed services. There is no reason why anyone should oppose this bill, as I see it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, all this is very interesting, but what has been said here has nothing to do with the objections to the bill. If my distinguished friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] will accept an amendment to this bill, to make it do what he says it does, there would be no objection to it. But when the gentleman stands up and says that this does not interfere with Wherry housing, then I suggest that he read the bill; because in locations where there are vacancies in Wherry housing the contractors were told that they would be permitted to build additional housing.

Why am I interested? Because all this backs up against the Committee on Appropriations and against my subcommittee, because we have to put up the money for the mortgages that are involved in this housing.

If the gentlemen who are urging this bill here today will accept amendments on the floor to make the bill do what they have testified here that it would do, there would be no objection. But the bill as it is does not do those things that they say it does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Of course, I cannot give the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] any assurance about that. But inasmuch as the gentleman has logic on his side, according to his own best judgment, I hope that he is not going to deny giving the membership of the House the value of his good judgment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I should like to propound an interrogation to the gentleman from California. Will the gentleman from California assure us that he can guarantee Wherry housing at installations that are not permanent?

Mr. PHILLIPS. You have some in here now that are not permanent.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman knows that you cannot get Wherry housing on installations that are not permanent. I am asking the gentleman if he can assure that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are not interested in that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. How are we going to get housing for the families in the service if we cannot get private housing, unless the Government builds the housing? That is what this bill does.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are not even arguing the point; the gentleman is correct. All I am trying to do is to defend the \$1.4 billion that the taxpayers now have invested in Wherry housing, instead of adding it to the national debt.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The taxpayers have not invested a cent in Wherry housing. If the gentleman says that, he does not understand what Wherry housing is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I accept the correction; the gentleman is right.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I have some figures here that might be of interest. First of all, the testimony before our committee indicated that the services were having great difficulty in getting sponsors for Wherry housing. Some people who support Wherry housing think it is a fine thing, and originally it might have been. Actually in 1953 the FHA approved some 55 Wherry housing projects. It is interesting to note that during the first half of that year 52 of those were approved, and during the second half of the year only 3 were approved.

I do not know, but it is also interesting to relate that to Public Law 94 of 1953, which required the sponsor to certify as to his replacement costs, which was the basis upon which the Federal Government guaranteed the mortgages of the Wherry housing. We have not gone into that deeply enough. The other body is going into the question. But I suggest it does have some bearing on the proposition that is before us today. We simply cannot get the sponsors today. There might be an opening for skulduggery, we do not know. I think it is something to consider.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I call the attention of the gentleman to a letter I received from Roy Smith, of the First National Bank at Killeen, Tex. This letter appears at page 5497 of the full committee and sub-

committee hearings on the bill (H. R. 9463) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the Department of Defense and their dependents and to authorize a program for providing such family quarters, and for other purposes. The letter is as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Killeen, Tex., June 18, 1954.

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GAVIN: I notice in the press that the Defense Department has requested appropriated funds to build military housing in certain areas, one of the areas being Fort Hood, Tex.

I want to urge your favorable consideration of the request made by the Defense Department. Fort Hood now has 568 Wherry units. These units were constructed in 1951-52. The mayor of our town, members of the military affairs committee of our chamber of commerce, and other interested parties worked closely with the personnel at Fort Hood, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency in obtaining the 568 Wherry units and in planning the type of construction. At that time Congress would not appropriate funds for the construction of military housing; therefore, Wherry housing was the only answer. The citizens of this area are fully convinced that Wherry housing is not the answer for military housing. It is costly to the taxpayers, does not fulfill the needs of military personnel, and makes available to the sponsor profits from the pockets of the citizens of this country.

Housing constructed with appropriated funds is built by private industry for the Government on competitive bids assuring reasonable cost to the Government, and no individual thereafter receives a lucrative income as is done under Wherry housing. Those who represent to you that Wherry housing is cheaper to the taxpayers have only a selfish personal gain in mind.

Again let me urge that you give favorable consideration to the request of the Defense Department, thereby giving to the military satisfactory housing at a lower cost to the taxpayers of our country.

Yours very truly,

ROY SMITH.

Killeen, Tex., is not in my State, but this letter expresses what the people are thinking about the Wherry housing programs.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in recapitulation and conclusion, I would bring this to the attention of the Members:

First, I think we are all convinced that there is inadequate housing for the military, especially the enlisted men.

Second, it is important that by making the service more attractive you get more enlistments and more reenlistments. This cuts down the drafting of our youth to forced service.

Another factor I think is important is that it will not be necessary to appropriate as much as it appears, for the reasons that now tens and tens of thousands in congested areas in the large cities, instead of being quartered on the field or base, are given money to go out and compete with private citizens around that area in getting quarters for themselves and their families.

Another factor which I mentioned, and which I repeat, is in regard to many thousands of young men who are entitled to the benefits of the GI bill of

rights. If we make it more attractive for them to remain the service, they will not be taking advantage of the rights under the GI bill, such as going through colleges, and so forth, and there will be a saving from that standpoint, and we will be keeping those experienced men in the service.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I am in hearty accord with the principles enunciated and with what is sought to be accomplished by the bill. I am very fearful that under this bill we are going to have a worse housing scandal than we already have had under the FHA housing. This is not essential housing which is going to be built because, as is indicated here in St. Albans in New York City, you have a \$16,000 unit. That is not housing which is essential for the military. That is luxury housing. The same thing applies in this other instance; you have 3 units here for \$88,000. That is almost \$30,000 a unit. That is not essential housing for enlisted men—that is luxury housing. This bill is bad.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I suggest to the gentleman that after the rule is adopted he can bring out those facts during the general discussion on the bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. In connection with the letter which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] read, that is most interesting to me. At Elizabeth City in North Carolina, where there is a naval establishment, private citizens desired to build housing which was necessary and the officers of the naval establishment insisted on Wherry housing.

This discussion makes one doubt who is making the correct statement here and who is not. I want to see adequate housing for the naval personnel and the armed services personnel, but I do believe where private money is anxious and willing to build adequate housing at a fair price, then the Federal Government and the armed services should not insist otherwise. I have had that experience and I called down here to the gentleman in charge of Wherry housing, and he insisted that Wherry housing should be built there instead of having the housing built by private money adjacent to the base and at assured rentals. Now what is the answer to that kind of a situation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I say to the gentleman that after the adoption of the rule, the rule is an open one and is subject to amendment, and a full discussion can be had on the bill and the gentleman may bring those facts out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear from the question raised and all of the debate we have had on the rule that it is essential that we adopt the rule in order to discuss these questions. The questions are legitimate and they

are involved in the bill. I think we will all agree, at least those who know about the military, whether they be military men or civilians, are greatly concerned about the inability to retain our career personnel. This Congress has recognized that within the past few weeks or days by greatly increasing the reenlistment bonuses. Sometime ago Congress recognized the fact that we were losing our career commissioned personnel by placing restrictions upon retirement even after 30 years of service and requiring service on active duty until such time as the person reached the statutory age of retirement. Under that provision, all of the services found it necessary to refuse permission for any regular commissioned personnel to resign their commissions. So we are faced with the absolute necessity of doing something to retain our career personnel, enlisted as well as commissioned.

Also, those who know about the military situation regard housing as one of the primary reasons that you lose your career personnel.

I do not care how badly a man might want to remain in the service, his family will not let him unless they are properly housed, and unless we take steps to discontinue family separation. So long as you have family separation, so long as you have inadequate housing, with your families living under improper circumstances, the families are not going to permit him to reenlist. They are going to continue to urge him to resign.

I feel that this Congress cannot adjourn without doing something about military housing. The military want housing. They need housing. The Defense Department requested of us in the public works bill, which was passed recently, a blank check to build military housing in such amounts and at such places as they desired. That was contrary to our traditional system. Our traditional system has been that we build family quarters with appropriated funds, and the Congress always determined the station at which they would be built and the number to be built in that station. So that we did not give the Defense Department what they asked in that instance. They asked for 25,000 units, and we have allowed only 13,000, or a little over, in this bill. Those are to be built with appropriated funds, it is true. They are to be built by the Corps of Army Engineers, for the Army and the Air Force, and by the Bureau of Yards and Docks for the Navy. They are going to be built under competitive bids. They are not going to be any windfall profits in connection with these houses. Do not forget that, before you vote not to consider this rule. A hearing now going on in the other body involves Wherry as well as FHA housing. This bill contains no windfall profits. This bill requires competitive bids for every one of these units.

You are going to spend the money whether you build these houses or not. Last year what did we pay for quarters allowances to the military personnel of the United States? One billion, three hundred and four million, four hundred and forty-three thousand dollars. That is statutory. That is a part of their

compensation. It is paid as a quarters allowance. So long as you do not give Government quarters to a person entitled to quarters allowance, then you have to pay him in cash. Whenever you furnish him with adequate Government quarters, the Government keeps that quarters allowance. These things can all be discussed on their merits in the committee. Under the Wherry Housing Act, where a sponsor pays \$8,100 for a house the Government does not own the house for a minimum of 32 years. During that 32 years Congress will have appropriated approximately \$50,000 against a housing unit which cost in the first place only \$8,100.

These houses built by appropriated funds will be amortized by the retention of quarters allowances, which is not paid. They will amortize themselves over a period of from 13 to 16 years, and the Government will own them absolutely.

I plead with you to adopt this rule. Do not go home and tell the Armed Forces that Congress is not interested in housing, whereas the Defense Department is; the burden does not belong here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there have been objections raised to specific line items in this bill as if that were some reason for voting against the rule on the bill. I would like to emphasize that those things can be amended when we get to them. As a member of the committee which sat and heard all the deliberations, let me say we did the very best we could to correct any difficulties that might arise in the line items. There may be a few that need correction but those can be corrected after the rule is granted.

Objection has been made that the housing in specific instances is costly. There are differences in costs depending upon who will occupy these houses. An enlisted man's house runs \$12,850 and the amounts go up to a general officer's house of \$27,000. It is estimated that each type will be amortized on the basis of the particular rent of allotment applicable to those who will occupy them. Obviously, the larger rental allotments applicable to general officers could amortize a more expensive type of house than could be amortized from the lower rental allotments applicable to enlisted personnel. The amount of those allotments is determined by existing law, not by the bill before us now.

Let me call attention to another type of opposition which has developed, the opposition of people who are interested in Wherry housing. I would like to emphasize that this very opposition is an indication of the dangers of Wherry housing. When we are appropriating money for only 10 percent of the unmet needs of the peacetime strength of the armed services it seems strange and unreasonable that we should have opposition from sponsors of Wherry housing units, to the

building of housing at bases where there is not any Wherry housing whatsoever.

You can readily see the danger which has been underlined for you; for some of the Wherry sponsors seem to take the position that those sponsors have a legitimate right not only to prevent the Government's building what it needs to build for the service personnel at a base where there may be existing Wherry housing, but also to prevent the construction of any new military housing, even where there is no Wherry housing at the location.

Here today we have a bill which contains scarcely any provision for housing to be established at bases where there are Wherry housing units, yet we have a concerted lobby opposing this legislation.

Every time you build a new housing unit, regardless of how much it is needed at a military base, the Wherry housing people can come in and say that we are depreciating the value of their housing and giving them a more difficult market. They make the point that it is depreciating their property. This can make good sense where there is already Wherry housing, but even there it can also greatly impede, and perhaps even prevent, the construction of needed housing. This debate today underlines dangers created by the Wherry housing concept. I sincerely hope that the House will approve this bill before us today.

During recent years we have heard much about the need for making military service an attractive career but there has not been enough accomplished in this field to achieve that much desired result. A military career at best is a most demanding one and a man who is asked to devote his life to the defense of his country deserves at least equal consideration in those amenities which we call the American way of life as his civilian neighbor. Those of us who are privileged to serve on the Committee on Armed Services are perhaps more keenly aware of this than other Members of Congress.

The American soldier is, we believe, the best trained and best equipped soldier in the world. He should also be the best dressed, the best paid, and the best housed soldier. There is room for improvement in all facets of the morale field. The need for family housing is not the least of these. I am informed that a large majority of men who resign or fail to reenlist cite as a prime reason, the insecurity they feel in the important problem of maintaining normal family life in the transient life that is military service.

I do not minimize the great good done for the cause of military family housing by the Wherry Act. The act has provided sizable quantities of quarters for the average or middle group of our military population. It has not been, however, the complete answer that many of its proponents contend. We have, therefore, continued reports of enlisted men living in virtual squalor or paying rents far beyond their means to obtain decent shelter for their families. Many of these men are technicians, trained by the Government at great expense in the intricacies of modern warfare. The loss to the

Government occasioned by the cost of retraining replacements when such valuable men leave the service is immeasurable. The danger to our military posture in failing to maintain fully trained forces is grave. It is all the more tragic when we recognize that much of this loss of trained manpower is due to our failure to meet our basic commitment to the soldier in the form of decent and adequate housing.

The family housing to be authorized in this bill represents only a small part of the outstanding requirement for family housing in the three services. In the Army, for example, this bill would provide 5,000 houses against a need today of 80,000. Virtually all of these 5,000 houses for the Army will replace existing substandard units on Army stations. The fact that these substandard units are, under the housing policies of the Army, occupied only on a voluntary basis and yet are fully occupied, points up the desperation with which the married soldier seeks a place for his family to live. Unhappily, many of these substandard houses will probably continue to be occupied even after the housing in this bill is provided. The need is too great for all of them to be demolished as they should be. We have given much attention to the matter of slum clearance in our cities and yet we have been unable to raze our military slums.

Aside from the responsibility we bear for insuring that the American military man is allowed a decent place to live, the Congress must recognize that provision of Government quarters is, in the long run, good business. Within a reasonable length of time, approximately 20 to 25 years, the cost of these family quarters will be amortized by the saving in quarters allowances which would otherwise have to be paid the military people who will occupy them. We are appropriating funds for quarters allowances today for personnel to occupy Wherry Act housing and we will continue to do so for 50 years unless the Wherry housing falls down first. For every dollar spent in building Government-owned family housing, two will be spent in payment of quarters allowances to those who occupy Wherry housing if the latter is all that were to be provided. The reason is that payments for quarters allowances to Wherry housing occupants continues long after the cost of the housing is amortized.

The Congress has just completed action on a military public works bill which provides 25,000 permanent barracks and bachelor officers' quarters for the Army, recognizing that these single men deserve a decent place to live. The bill before the House would do the same for the married man. I urge its prompt adoption.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill has been considerably changed since it was originally presented. Originally it called for a \$350 million housing program. It has been reduced to \$175 million. The Armed Services Commit-

tee carefully considered the proposed legislation, then requested that the Department of Defense reconsider the whole program and present to the committee a program with line items and a policy for developing the whole overall program.

Several weeks later the Department of Defense presented to the committee a proposed program of line items, a program that was given careful consideration by the committee for many weeks, after which a subcommittee was appointed for the purpose of screening of the line items included in the bill. After weeks of study and consideration the subcommittee reported out this bill that is now before us. This bill before us represents only 10 percent of the overall requirements for housing, for the services, Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. It represents the very minimum required for the services in way of housing. I therefore sincerely hope the Committee will pass favorably on this rule so we can proceed with this bill.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, I am in complete support of this rule and in support of the bill. I think that the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has done an outstanding job. This is one of the most needed pieces of legislation, in my opinion, that has come up in this House, and I think it will be a great crime not to do this for the soldiers and officers.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Illinois prepared to move the previous question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes, I am.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no further requests for time. We are anxious to have the rule disposed of so we can get along, but I desire to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] for a consent request.

(Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

AN EVALUATION OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, because of the significance of the textile industry in the Nation and in my own State of North Carolina, I have during recent months made an extensive study of this important subject. I have secured significant assistance from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and from other reliable sources which will be indicated from time to time in the RECORD.

This evaluation is being made because of my personal interest in the subject of textiles. The study has been brought together with the hope it will bring some food for thought to research groups, promoting agencies at the local and State levels, as well as the textile industry itself. I am primarily interested in local communities so vitally affected in the sale of an existing plant, the merger of a mill with a great chain, a new mill, not to mention a mill which goes "sour."

First, I want to discuss the following: Location textile employment; growth; growth in North Carolina in relation to other branches of industry; cotton consumption; spindle hours; yarn and hosiery employment; maturity cloth weaving industry; general trends in North Carolina.

LOCATION OF TEXTILE EMPLOYMENT

There were 5 Southern States and 5 States in New England in which as many as 10 percent of the people employed in manufacturing worked in textile mills. Nearly half the textile workers in the United States—44 percent—were employed in the south Atlantic region and 1 in 5 was employed in North Carolina. There were almost as many textile workers in North Carolina in 1952 as there were in all of the New England States together.

In order to grasp the geographical impact of textile employment, I submit the following table:

TABLE 1.—Persons employed in textiles and in all manufacturing: 1952, by region and for selected States

[All employees: average number in thousands]

	Total manufacturing	Textile industries	Percentage in textiles
United States.....	15,944.4	1,134.7	7.1
South Atlantic States.....	1,739.4	502.3	28.9
North Carolina.....	418.6	219.0	52.3
South Carolina.....	202.9	132.8	65.4
Georgia.....	294.5	101.4	34.4
Middle Atlantic States.....	4,269.2	255.6	6.0
New England States.....	1,497.0	222.1	14.8
Maine.....	108.3	23.1	21.3
New Hampshire.....	1 (85.4)	1 (22.4)	26.2
Vermont.....	42.2	4.1	9.7
Massachusetts.....	702.7	92.5	13.2
Rhode Island.....	131.7	48.4	36.7
East South Central.....	677.7	91.4	13.5
Alabama.....	213.0	49.3	23.1
Tennessee.....	241.2	33.4	13.8
West South Central.....	667.9	12.3	1.8
East North Central.....	4,705.8	35.0	.7
West North Central.....	931.0	6.8	.7
Mountain States.....	174.6	(2)	-----
Pacific States.....	1,281.8	8.1	.6

¹ Figures for 1951. Data for 1952 textiles not available for New Hampshire.

² Not available.

Source: Bureau of the Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1952. Tables 1 (p. 20) and 4 to 12, inclusive (pp. 48-78). See especially table 8, pp. 64-67 for North Carolina and South Atlantic States. Pennsylvania is the only State not shown which has as many as 100,000 employees in textiles: 121,432 in textiles but 1,543,380 in all industries. (Ibid., p. 54.) The following States had more than 30,000 employees in textiles: Connecticut (33,900), New York (77,400), New Jersey (56,700), and Virginia (39,700).

Textile employment is negligible in the States west of the Mississippi. It appears to be decreasing in the Pacific States and Texas, and it may be declining in the West North Central States, but the totals are too small to be important. Figures for the Mountain States are given only in years when there is a complete census of manufactures.

GROWTH OF TEXTILE EMPLOYMENT BY REGION

The increase in textile employment in North Carolina from 1951 to 1952, as shown by the census, was unique. Employment held its own from 1951 to 1952 in South Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee. It declined in Georgia and Alabama, as well as in New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

To illustrate this growth I invite your attention to the following significant data:

TABLE 2.—Employment in textile industries by regions: 1939-52

[Average number in thousands]

Region, State	Production workers ¹		All employees ²		
	1939	1947	1947	1950 ³	1952
United States Total.....	1,081.7	1,147.2	1,233.4	1,245.2	1,134.7
New England.....	260.6	260.7	283.0	268.3	222.1
Middle Atlantic.....	275.1	264.7	293.5	306.3	255.6
South Atlantic.....	395.4	461.3	484.3	499.8	502.3
East South Central.....	81.9	92.2	96.9	95.6	91.4
East North Central.....	44.7	40.6	45.3	43.7	35.0
West North Central.....	6.5	7.5	8.4	8.3	6.8
West South Central.....	11.3	11.7	11.8	12.3	12.3
Mountain.....	.5	.6	n. a.	n. a.	n. a.
Pacific.....	6.8	7.8	9.1	8.4	8.1
North Carolina.....	181.2	200.9	210.4	213.4	219.0
South Carolina.....	94.8	119.3	124.6	129.1	132.8
Virginia.....	28.0	31.5	33.9	37.2	39.7
Georgia.....	79.4	98.3	102.5	107.1	101.4
Alabama.....	39.9	49.9	52.1	52.3	49.3
Tennessee.....	33.6	33.9	35.9	34.7	33.4

¹ Census of Manufactures 1947, vol. I, table 6, pp. 54-55, for United States and regional totals; vol. III, table 3 for each State shown—Alabama (p. 69), Georgia (p. 155), North Carolina (p. 452), South Carolina (p. 555), Tennessee (p. 571), Virginia (p. 615).

² U. S. Bureau of Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1951 for 1947 and 1950 data. (United States, table I, p. 21), (New England, table III, p. 49), (Middle Atlantic, table IV, p. 53), (East North Central, table V, p. 57), (West North Central, table VI, p. 61), (South Atlantic States, table VII, pp. 65 and 67), (East South Central, table VIII, p. 69), (West South Central, table IX, p. 73), (Pacific, table XI, p. 79). Data for 1952 from Annual Survey, 1952.

³ 1950 is shown in preference to 1951, as 1950 was generally a year of good employment in textiles, more comparable with 1947 than 1951 would be. This was especially true for New England and the Middle Atlantic States. Either 1950 or 1951 might be used to represent peak textile employment in Georgia and the east south central region. Employment increased from 1950 to 1951 in Virginia and South Carolina and then remained essentially unchanged in 1952. North Carolina grew in each year since 1949. (See table above.)

Let me point out the following interesting trends in textile employment. Generally speaking, the trend of textiles into the South Atlantic States seems to have continued through 1952. Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were growing relatively more than Georgia. The tendency to growth of textile employment is much less noticeable in the East South Central States, including Alabama and Tennessee, and has not extended to Texas.

Employment in New England and the Middle Atlantic States is continuing to decline. New England held its own from 1939 to 1947, but lost workers from 1947 to 1950, as well as from 1950 to 1952. The Middle Atlantic States and East North Central States each had fewer workers in textiles in 1947 than in 1939. The decline in the Middle Atlantic States was interrupted in 1950, but was resumed at an accelerated rate through 1952. While these two areas lost about 16 or 17 percent of their textile employment between 1939 and 1952—partly because 1952 was a poor year for textiles—the east north central region lost nearly 30 percent of its textile employment.

The evidence of the census suggests that North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia—the old centers of southern textiles—have begun to grow again, whereas the rate of growth in Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee has diminished since 1947. It will be noticed that there was no increase in textile employment in Tennessee from 1939 to 1947 and a 10-percent increase in North Carolina

and Virginia. On the other hand, there was an increase of approximately 25 percent in South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama.

From 1947 to 1952 textile employment increased 5,800, or 17 percent, in Virginia; 8,600, or 4 percent, in North Carolina; and 8,200, or 7 percent, in South Carolina; while employment in Georgia and Alabama in 1952 was lower than in 1947.

Census data are not available in detail by States since 1947. Therefore, it is impossible from census data to explain these employment trends in terms of specific types of textile production. However, it is known that woolen and worsteds have moved to the South in substantial amount, and that trends favoring the South continue in full-fashioned hosiery and textile finishing plants.

All that seems clear is that there is no evidence in these figures of an overall trend against North Carolina in textile employment.

GROWTH OF TEXTILE EMPLOYMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA AS RELATED TO BRANCHES OF THE INDUSTRY IN NORTH CAROLINA

The so-called textile industry is, of course, many industries, rather than one. That is revealed in a study of the following analysis:

TABLE 3.—Employment in the textile industries of North Carolina and the United States, 1947 and 1952

[All employees: Average in thousands]

	1947		1952	United States ²
	North Carolina ¹	Percent in North Carolina		
Total textiles ³	210.4	17.0	1,233.4	1,134.7
Cotton and rayon broad goods.....	87.1	-----	455.0	420.4
Cotton.....	71.0	19.8	357.4	317.9
Rayon.....	16.1	16.5	97.6	102.5
Yarn and thread (excluding wool).....	57.6	46.6	123.6	110.9
Thread.....	1.3	8.8	14.7	14.8
Knitting.....	49.7	21.6	230.5	236.8
Seamless hosiery.....	26.7	41.2	64.8	61.7
Full-fashioned hosiery.....	16.5	23.6	70.0	65.5
Knit underwear.....	4.2	10.3	40.6	35.6
Knit fabric.....	1.6	11.3	14.2	35.6
Knit outerwear.....	.7	-----	34.8	50.3
Other ⁴	-----	-----	(6.1)	(6.2)
Woolen and worsted.....	5.8	3.2	180.1	124.7
Finishing (excluding wool).....	5.0	6.4	78.0	83.2
Carpets.....	1.4	2.4	57.2	52.9
Narrow fabrics.....	1.1	3.9	27.7	23.5
Hats (excluding cloth and millinery).....	(4)	-----	21.4	18.6
Miscellaneous.....	2.7	4.5	60.0	63.8

¹ Census of Manufactures 1947, vol. III: North Carolina, table 4, p. 452.

² U. S. Bureau of Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures 1952, table 1, pp. 22-23.

³ Components in North Carolina do not add to total because of omissions to prevent disclosures. The apparent residuals for knit goods have been computed.

⁴ Not available.

The distribution of employment by branches has favored the growth of textile employment in North Carolina in two ways:

(a) Percentagewise employment declined less from 1947 to 1952 in those

TABLE 11.—*Production workers in manufacturing industries, North Carolina: 1939 and 1947*

[Average number in thousands]

	1939	1947
Textile mill products.....	181.2	200.9
Lumber and products.....	19.5	29.7
Furniture and fixtures.....	18.4	25.9
Tobacco manufacturers (except stemming).....	16.8	² 16.9
Apparel and related products.....	6.5	15.7
Food and kindred products.....	6.3	11.6
Chemicals and allied products.....	6.2	7.5
Paper and allied products.....	3.3	6.4
Stone, clay, and glass products.....	3.2	5.1
Printing and publishing.....	2.3	3.4
Machinery (except electrical).....	1.4	3.3
Electrical machinery.....	.1	3.4
Primary metals.....	1.3	1.7
Fabricated metals.....	.6	2.3
Transportation equipment.....	.7	1.1
Leather and products.....	1.0	1.4
Others.....	.5	1.3
Total (except tobacco stemming).....	269.2	337.6
Tobacco stemming and redrying.....	(³)	12.6
Published totals.....	269.2	350.2

¹ Lumber and products does not include logging or sawmills with an output of less than 200,000 board feet. These are included in annual surveys for later years.

² The published figures for tobacco manufacturers in 1947 show 29,482 production workers, of whom 12,578 are in stemming and redrying. The latter total has been deducted in order to secure totals for 1947 that may be compared with those for 1939.

³ Not available.

Source: Census of Manufactures, 1947, vol. III, North Carolina, tables 3 and 4, pp. 452-454.

Even when it comes to describing the growth of manufacturing employment in North Carolina by major categories we can trace trends only as far as 1947. From 1947 to 1952 it is not possible on the basis of sample data alone to indicate the growth of machinery production or show a number of other major types of manufacturing activity in North Carolina.

MATURITY OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRIES

North Carolina still has a growing textile industry. Other types of manufacturing employment have been growing somewhat more rapidly than textile manufacturing. The following table indicates that whereas about two-thirds of the workers in manufacturing industries were employed in textile mills in 1939, only slightly more than one-half were in textile mills in 1952:

TABLE 12.—*Total manufacturing and textile employment, North Carolina: 1939-52*

[Average number in thousands]

Year	All manufacturing (adjusted)	Textiles	Others	Percentage in textiles ¹
All employees:				
1952.....	² 415.0	219.0	196.0	52.8
1951.....	² 409.8	215.4	194.4	52.6
1950.....	² 405.6	213.4	192.2	52.6
1949.....	² 366.1	198.4	167.7	54.2
1947.....	¹ 381.5	210.4	171.1	55.1
Production workers:				
1947.....	³ 337.6	200.9	136.7	59.5
1939.....	292.2	181.2	88.0	67.3

¹ The annual surveys for 1949-52 attempt to include employment in logging operations and in sawmills producing less than 200,000 board feet. These were not included in the 1947 census. Since they cannot be excluded from the total in these years, part of the increased employment in "other" manufacturing industries and part of the decrease in the percentage of workers employed in textiles are apparent rather than real.

² 1949-52 employment figures as published include the following totals for "administrative and auxiliary"

workers in central offices which were not included in the 1947 census: 1949, 2,714; 1950, 2,712; 1951, 2,712; 1952, 3,645. These amounts have been deducted from the published figures to secure a total more nearly comparable to the census total for 1947.

³ The census of manufactures in 1939 did not include "stemming and redrying tobacco." In 1947 (and later years) it was treated as a manufacturing industry. The published total for production workers in North Carolina in the 1947 census of manufactures (vol. III, p. 452) is 350,200, of whom 12,600 were in tobacco stemming and redrying establishments. This number has been deducted from both the total for manufacturing and for other industries in 1947 to derive totals that may be compared with those for 1939.

Sources: 1939 and 1947: Census of Manufactures, 1947, vol. III, North Carolina, tables 3 and 4, p. 452. 1947-1952: U. S. Bureau of the Census, Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1951 and 1952, table 7, pp. 66-67 (1951), and table 8, p. 66 (1952).

However, the textile industry is one of the oldest in the United States and for the United States as a whole there has been no increase in the total amount of textile employment since 1937. This can be seen from the following table, which traces employment from 1937 to 1952. There was a decrease in the number of production workers between 1937 and 1939, and then an increase between 1939 and 1947, so that textiles as a whole employed about the same number of production workers in 1947 as had been employed in 1937. Between 1947 and 1952 we measure employment changes in terms of all employees rather than in terms of production workers. However, as the table shows, there was about the same amount of employment in 1950 as there had been in 1947. Both of these were years with a rather high level of textile production. There was less employment in textile mills in 1952 than there had been in 1950, but this was a depressed year for textiles.

TABLE 13.—*Manufacturing employment in the United States: 1937-52, all manufacturing industries and textile mill products*

	All manufacturing	Textiles	Percent in textiles
All employees:			
1952.....	15,944	1,135	7.1
1950.....	14,770	1,245	8.4
1949.....	13,880	1,170	8.4
1947.....	14,294	1,233	8.6
Production workers:			
1947.....	11,916	1,147	9.6
1939.....	7,806	1,082	13.8
1939 ¹	7,887	1,083	13.7
1937.....	8,569	1,138	13.3

¹ The census of manufactures classified manufacturing establishments on a slightly different basis in the census of 1947 and the census of 1939. One of the figures for 1939 is in terms that are comparable to the figures for 1947; the other 1939 figure may be compared with 1937. Because of the change in classification no continuous series can be shown.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, Annual Surveys of Manufactures, 1949-52; Census of Manufactures, 1939 and 1947.

In view of the thought expressed here involving areas of declining employment it is my intention within the next few days to prepare a second and final statement on the textile industry. This statement will point out the interconnection between the wide cyclical swings that have plagued the textile industry and the development of stranded communities which have grown up around now-abandoned mills. I am particularly concerned, however, not with further describing the problems of the textile industry but of pointing out the necessity of continuous efforts by all groups con-

cerned to do those things which will bring greater stabilization and more certain growth to the textile communities of the Nation. In the past there has been too much of a tendency for people to be concerned about the textile industry when the country is in the grip of a recession and to forget about the problems of the textile industry when the general business situation begins to improve.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas such time as he may use.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a telegram from the Topeka Board of Real Estate Dealers in Topeka requesting that I introduce an amendment to the bill because there has been deleted from the bill any appropriation for housing at Forbes Air Base. I wish to call the attention of the House to this matter. It is very important. I called the commander of the Forbes Air Base and he informed me that there is the possibility of wrecks and the loss of crews and airplanes because of this deletion. Therefore I intend to offer an amendment asking the House to include in this bill authorization for construction of 25 residential units at an estimated cost of \$337,500.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9924, with Mr. MORANO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, today we are presenting for your consideration H. R. 9924, which will be the last major piece of legislation that the Armed Services Committee will report this year.

We are sorry our great chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. DEWEY SHORT, is not able to be with us today. Those of us that have worked intimately with him realize the tremendous burden that has been his in this Congress. He has performed wonderfully well. His leadership has been superb. The accomplishments of our committee in this Congress are a reflection of that leadership. Unfortunately he has primary opposition but we all know that his record will cause his constituents to return him

to the House of Representatives where he is so badly needed.

We are submitting a housing bill to you authorizing some housing units that are badly needed. This is a very important bill; much more important than its title indicates. Everyone knows what a delicate security problem faces us. Charles Lindbergh that great hero, that fabulous private citizen, who has contributed so much to our defense problems both in peace and in war, recently wrote a short magazine article entitled "Our Best Chance to Survive," in which he placed clearly before us the precarious position in which we find ourselves. He made this comment, which bears on the importance of the serviceman's morale:

Fleets of atomic aircraft, costing billions of dollars, can be operated efficiently only by a skilled, satisfied and experienced personnel; yet thousands of expert airmen leave the service each year to get better jobs in civil life. Economy itself demands that in this complicated electromechanistic age long years of expensive training should be followed by opportunities, pay and conditions which encourage people to remain in the careers they were trained for.

There is nothing that makes for domestic stability and harmony more than pleasant living conditions for young married couples. Most of the houses provided by this bill are for enlisted men or junior officers, perhaps as much as 85 percent of the total units which we propose to build. The total which we have in the bill is 13,620 units of housing divided as follows: 9,000 for enlisted men, 4,600 for officers.

The estimated cost for this group of houses is more than the amount which we have in the bill as a limitation on the cost of this housing. The limit of expenditure in the bill is \$175 million that may be spent under this authorization. This means that a considerable group of the houses authorized will be screened out by those who have the responsibility of seeing that the houses are built.

I wish to give a brief background of the bill. Originally the Defense Department presented the Armed Services Committee with a program for the construction of military houses at an aggregate cost of \$350 million. The \$350 million was a fund of unexpended appropriations which had come out of various sources of expenditures, all of which were military. The Defense Department witnesses submitted a plan known as a lease-purchase plan to construct these houses. It should be remembered in considering this bill that every officer and most of the enlisted men receive compensation for their services and also what is known as quarters allowances. In other words, the military man receives pay and is furnished quarters, or in lieu thereof, we give them a certain sum each month so he may provide his own quarters. If you will look at page 2 of the report you will notice that for 1954 there was spent over \$1,400,000,000 for quarters' allowances. The total for fiscal 1955 was \$1,254,959,000. The sad thing about those expenditures is that after they are made, nothing is recouped by the Government. The suggested plan of the Defense Department

was that, if we built quarters in the traditional manner they have been provided throughout the history of the armed service, we would then reduce the expenditures of the Defense Department by the sum we have been appropriating each year for quarters' allowances. The savings made by not having to appropriate for quarters' allowances would in a few years, perhaps not exceeding 15 years, be an item as large as the total cost of the houses in which the officers and enlisted men live. If the houses were substantially built, it would mean that after that period of time, the only cost to the Government would be upkeep. However, there were so many complications and deviations from the strict plan proposed that we finally determined that we should have a more exhaustive study made of the so-called lease-purchase plan. I might say that I personally am in favor of such a plan and have been for several years. In fact, I introduced a bill containing a plan similar to this in the 81st Congress and was unable to arouse any interest in it, except in the mind of Hon. Robert Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, who thought the plan a good one and emphatically so stated to me. Furthermore, he designated Gen. Grandison Gardner to work with me to develop a bill which would include the plan which I submitted of using allowances to pay for the houses in which the officers and enlisted men lived. The bill was sent to the Air Force where it was delayed and was only sent back to our committee in the dying days of the Congress in which it was introduced. In other words, the bill was sidetracked because of a lack of interest in the plan, although the United States Air Force profess to be very anxious to get houses for enlisted men and officers and instead put their faith in the so-called Wherry housing.

Consequently, after discussing the matter informally the Armed Services Committee decided that a special committee should be appointed by Chairman SHORT which would provide a method of utilizing \$175 million for the construction of houses as set forth in the line items in the bill which was before us when the Defense Department officials were testifying. The chairman appointed me as chairman of the subcommittee and we held exhaustive hearings for about 10 or 12 days. I must pay my tribute to the men who served on this subcommittee. They were most courteous, helpful, constructive, and patient. We had a difficult job to do and it was not always easy to bring our various ideas into complete agreement, but we worked together in complete harmony and wrote up the bill which is before you today. I would like to have my colleagues in the House remember that no matter what kind of a bill we might bring you any conclusion as to the selection of a group of houses at any station could be challenged on some grounds or other. We did the best we could. We had intelligent witnesses explain the need for each group of houses and we finally agreed upon the bill which is now before you. The main thing that I would like to emphasize again and again is the very bad

plight of the young officers and enlisted men, especially those in the grade of sergeant and above. Also, I emphasize again how desperately we need these men. These groups or teams, as you may call them, may be vital to our very existence. Airmen together with the officers that fly the planes must live together in a unit. They must be near their equipment, for you all know, without further elaboration on my part, that these men are on a 24-hour alert. If the call for their services should come, they must be prepared to get into the air within a matter of minutes. We have the same situation in the naval air arm, in the marine air arm, and even in the Army to a limited degree.

Furthermore, we have some very critical types of people who must be on a station and not far away where he may have had to rent a house. I refer to doctors, dentists, nurses, and special type personnel who are required to service and administer to our service men and women. I am sure, if everyone had sat through the hearings, as we did, they would realize that we must do something about this housing problem. In this group of houses we are only providing 10 percent of the need estimated as a requirement for a military force of the present size. You can readily see that it is essential that we take care of this first unit of houses. We are meeting competition for the services of our military personnel in two ways. In the first place, our trained personnel are being drained off by civilian industry because they pay more money. In the second place, we are being competed against by private enterprise because they can provide better housing and other benefits for their employees. All of you know that an up-to-date industry, when moving into a town to build a new plant, in many instances provides the houses in which their workers will live. It permits the employees to buy them at cost. This morale factor is important in any endeavor, but it is more important in the military field than in any other. The reason is that when the chips are down it is a matter of life or death, and a man who believes in what he is doing, as all of you know who have served, is the best soldier, sailor, airman, and the best leader. The leadership of the junior officers in the company grades and the field officers, and the top sergeants, can furnish more leadership when they have a happy, contented group to command. Ask any man on this floor, and I could mention a half a dozen great war heroes who learned this in the heat and struggle of battle, and they will tell you that my statement is correct.

Perhaps we are overly serious, but I do not believe that we can be too serious in the critical situation in which we find ourselves. I am not here to make reference to any errors made in the past. My committee and my special subcommittee are accepting the situation as we find it; facing the future as we must look at it and taking those steps, that our conviction and our experience dictates to be the right steps.

There are some houses here for senior officers, and if the past is any criterion, I presume we will hear some critical ob-

servations about these senior officers, generals, and admirals.

So I implore you to listen carefully to this debate. If you do, I am sure you will authorize the houses asked for in this bill and thereby improve the morale and the living conditions of those who may some day be called upon to save us from disaster. If we retain our present strength and maintain our trained personnel and do something to bolster up their morale that may be the very program that will prevent an atomic war, which we all pray and hope will never come.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Some apprehension has been expressed by people who are in Wherry housing areas. They express the fear that this could reduce the occupancy in Wherry housing units, and thereby defeat the success of the Wherry housing program. Now, is there any danger of that? What is the gentleman's reaction to that?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think there is any danger, because if you look at the hearings, we determined that we would not install houses where Wherry housing was in operation. There may be one or two isolated cases where that would occur, but on the whole, taking it by its four corners, the bill will not invade any Wherry housing areas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman does not think, nor does the committee think that there is any real danger in this bill to Wherry housing?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think there is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a controversial question. The gentleman's bill says otherwise.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think it does. We are prepared to offer an amendment that I have shown to the gentleman that I think will clear up the situation in the event it is in doubt; and I do not think it is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that two amendments and a statement from the chairman which should go in the Record may clear up the matter. I hope the gentleman will be good enough to give me some time to discuss this before we are through.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I should like to ask one question of the gentleman. I may say first of all that I am very much in sympathy with this bill as I have both West Point and Stewart Field in my district.

I am fully aware of the necessity of adequate housing for the officers and enlisted men, but I should like to ask the gentleman, if this question has been so carefully screened, why, on page 8, under Outside the Continental United

States, there is an appropriation of \$6,683,400; and out of that \$2,366,300 is for naval air activity at Port Lyautey, French Morocco, 175 units.

In view of the fact that it is quite evident to anyone who has been watching the situation abroad in the last few weeks, that the war clouds are certainly gathering over; and as it is also abundantly clear that every time another one of these holding wars is given up by our good allies, who are defeated, that our materiel is lost when the defeated armies move out, I wonder whether or not it would be wise to withhold some of that money in French Morocco at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They claim it is very badly needed. As the lady knows, we have a complex of airfields and strategic airbases, and also a large naval complement there.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I realize that, but in view of what may happen, I think it ought to be looked into again.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No matter where the men are, they have to have adequate housing; even if it is in Morocco.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But the men must be housed somewhere now. What is the situation at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They are having difficulty there. Some of us were there last year and found that they had very, very poor housing. It is almost shameful the way some of those men live. Furthermore, it is possible that some of these houses will be built with French money, although we will have to pay a certain amount of rental for the use of the property.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very briefly; I have very little time left.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman called attention to the fact that thousands of men are leaving the Air Force. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that not only are thousands of men leaving the Air Force, but there are thousands of men who are leaving the ground forces; the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, as well. I think we should understand that this is not legislation that affects specifically only one branch of the Service. It affects all branches of the Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think it is thoroughly understood by everybody that that is the case.

The main thing I would like to emphasize again and again is the very bad plight of the young enlisted men, especially those in the grades of sergeant and above. I emphasize again how desperately we need these men. These groups of teams, as you may call them, may be vital to our very existence. Airmen, together with the officers who fly the planes, must live as a unit. And they must be near their equipment for all of you know, without any further elaboration on my part, that they are on a 24-hour alert. The same thing applies to the Army and the same thing applies to the Navy, as my colleague mentioned a moment ago; and the same thing applies to the Marines.

I think I have indicated enough so that you can see what a terrible plight we are in and what our dire need is if we are to have reenlistments and save money by having reenlistments, because then we can keep our trained men. If we are to have good morale we must have at least passably decent housing conditions for our men.

I certainly hope the House will pass this bill so that word can go out to the men in all parts of the world that we are doing our level best as Members of the Congress to afford them a decent place in which to live.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. I believe the gentleman misunderstood the question of the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] when she asked about the housing in Morocco. I think the gentleman stated that the housing in Morocco might be built with French money and the United States would rent that housing. Would not that be impossible under this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is no specific authorization, but there is a plan under which that might be done.

Mr. BRAY. I am aware of that plan, but it is not included in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is no authorization in this bill along that line, but there is what is referred to as the French Wherry plan, to let them build the houses and rent them to our servicemen.

Mr. BRAY. I am aware of that, but I was afraid the Record would show that was included in this bill, and it is not.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is right; it is not.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The authorization for the naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., is 30 units of family housing, \$409,000, which would figure about \$13,000 per unit. Then there is an authorization in the naval district area of 4 units of family housing, \$108,000, or approximately \$27,000 per unit. Why the difference there?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think one authorization is for housing for the commanding officers, at \$27,000.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Those four houses are for vice-admirals who are stationed here in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. The others are for enlisted men, at \$13,000?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Some of them junior officers and enlisted men.

Mr. GROSS. It is twice as much for the officers as for the enlisted men?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Exactly; twice as much for a vice-admiral as for a sergeant.

Mr. GROSS. That is a good division of the spoils, in the wrong way.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am glad to know that the gentleman from California did specifically state that the portion of the committee report on page 7 which reads that this authorization will not require the appropriation of any new funds is not correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That was made before you people chopped down the amount for military expenditures.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not think it is necessary for me to justify the action of cutting that down because I do not believe the gentleman from California feels that the armed services ought to have a \$175-million fund that they can divert from one purpose to another, depending upon what the House may see fit to authorize in the closing days of the session.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is right. All we want to do is get the authority. We think we can make our case before the Appropriations Committee later so they will appropriate the money to build the houses.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That raises the next question that was brought before us by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], when he said he did not want the Congress to be put in the position of not going ahead and authorizing this money. I am wondering what solution the gentleman from California would now offer to the Appropriations Committee where it seems to me that in order to perform our functions properly under an authorization program of this kind we would have to hold probably about 2 weeks of hearings in order to be adequately informed to pass on that kind of appropriation. It seems to me we either have to do that or give a blank check without holding any hearings and say, "Go ahead and start on this program now." That puts us in a pretty bad situation.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. As I see it, it is a question of whether you are going to take the money out of one pocket to pay rental allowances or take it out of the other pocket to pay for these houses.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The people that are in charge of the program of providing these houses and who sought this authority will make the justifications before the gentleman's committee. We do not expect any of these houses to be built until next year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the point I wanted to make clear. That is somewhat different from the impression that would be created by the statement of the gentleman from Texas. We are really not in a position to go ahead and promise to these people in the armed services throughout the country that by action on this particular measure they are going to be able to go ahead and start building houses.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. All we want to justify to the armed services is

that we got the authorization. They will have to make their justification to you people, which I am sure they can do. I feel then that you will give us the necessary money.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to present H. R. 9924 for your special consideration. Your committee has examined into the details of this bill which is now before the House. I have found that a serious situation has grown up in the management of our Military Establishment which, I must say, does not reflect favorably on the past actions of either the executive department or upon the Congress itself. We have found that the country has failed to adjust itself to the present world conditions in that we are attempting to manage and operate our Military Establishment on a wartime basis but using peacetime concepts. At the present time, the factual situation shows that this country has called upon its young men, many of them married with families, to leave their civilian life with all of its attendant benefits, to enter into the service of their country with all of its difficulties. We seriously need these men now in this world of tension so that they may be trained in the use of complex equipment which they may be required to use in the event they are called upon to defend their country in time of war. We all recognize the day has gone when the armed services, and particularly the Air Force, can be manned almost overnight to meet the enemy. It takes long periods of training, in fact practically all of the first 4 years of enlistment, to train these men in the hard-core skills necessary to man our forces. Remember that we can have all of the best equipment in the world and still fail if the men who fight and maintain this equipment are not highly trained. Few of us, I am afraid, fully appreciate just how long this period of training is that is now required to create a qualified fighting man, and most particularly how much it actually costs the country and our economy when we lose these men after they have received this highly specialized training. I say to you that this bill seeks to correct one of the prime deficiencies that the military departments now have; namely, family housing, the lack of which is making the retention of highly trained personnel almost impossible. We have all heard many, many times of the welfare and morale of the services. The phrase "welfare and morale" has been overworked to the point of becoming a bromide. I wish to explain to you some of the dollar-and-cents results that the nebulous question of morale or lack of morale is costing this country in its Defense Establishment as it relates to housing. The members of the Armed Services Committee and myself have traveled throughout this country and overseas inspecting military installations. I am far from pleased with what I have seen. I am sure you would share with me the shame that I felt and members of my committee felt when we saw some of the hovels that our military personnel are forced to inhabit. They are

of various types. Some of them are converted garages, some temporary conversions or makeshift arrangements of barracks, others crowding into small quarters, doubling families, and so forth. Examples are numerous, but they all add up to one thing; namely, Americans do not live that way voluntarily. If the world is to continue its present armed-camp condition, we must of necessity see to it that our forces who are required to stand by and wait for the emergency to break are afforded at least the accommodations that they would normally live in if they were out of the military service. This is not asking too much of this great country of ours.

Sometimes in our consideration of housing, I feel that the Congress and the country have been too miserly for the reason, I suppose, that most of us know something about housing, its expenses, its drawbacks, and what it requires of individuals to become homeowners. None of us will hesitate to provide our services with the necessary implements of war, with airplanes, runways, hangars, and all of the many thousands of items of equipment that it takes to accomplish military security. We find that billions of dollars are being expended for these items and that they are necessary, yet when it comes down to the question of providing living quarters for the personnel who are to man such equipment we become ultraconservative and have adopted a negative approach. This bill, gentlemen, recognizes that there has been a fundamental, costly mistake in this area. In a small measure, this bill seeks to put the housing in its proper perspective and commence a sensible program of providing this relatively inexpensive necessity to our entire military program.

Remember, gentlemen, that our military people are subject to orders. The civilian can refuse to move and take jobs if housing is not available, but once a man has enlisted in the military service, or has been commissioned, he goes where he is ordered to go and where his country says he is needed without regard to the facilities provided for him and his family. He cannot refuse. It is up to us to recognize that we have not provided the essential housing in order that these men might live as Americans and as we would insist that they should live.

In our travels we have found that because of housing conditions many of the military officers and men when assigned to new locations are forced to buy houses at high prices. When orders come for them to move, they must sell those houses and buy new ones at the new location to which they have been assigned. It might be contended that in the past such personnel have made a profit on the purchase and sale of housing since the real-estate market was generally moving upward until this year. However, the fact indicates that such personnel are not in a position to speculate on whether the prices are going up or down, since all of their savings go into the purchase of such houses, plus the fact that they cannot hold them for a better price when selling because

they need the money out of the old house before buying another one at the new duty station. Gentlemen, we all know that if we were personally forced to buy and sell our homes every 2 years, that we could not hope to remain solvent. The saying in the military is that three moves will break you. Your committee believes that this is unfortunately true. I am sure that you will all agree with me that we are not considering the welfare of our people when we continue to force them into this type of situation. I am also sure that you will agree with me that such a condition cannot help but injure morale of the forces and, of course, the efficiency and effectiveness of our military forces.

Industry that operates on the profit motive has found it necessary to provide decent living quarters at a reasonable rent to its people. They have found it pays in the long run for the company itself to provide this housing if not otherwise available, and they have found it is not always otherwise available. As a practical matter, it amounts to money in the stockholders' pockets if by expending a relatively small amount of money for housing, they are able to stabilize their work force. We have expended great amounts of money for our military installations and equipment and very little for housing in order to stabilize our work force. Frankly, it does not make sense. Many examples of industry-built housing are undoubtedly known to each of you. A few outstanding ones that I desire to bring to your attention are such as action taken by the Hershey Chocolate Co., in Hershey, Pa. There we find a complete community. A current example is the Clarke Thread Co., of Albany, Ga. Here we find that the company has constructed 500 family units to be sold or rented to their employees. Another one is Fairless Works, United States Steel Co. at Morrisville, Pa. The company is developing a new community with all facilities, including 13,000 housing units for sale or rent to employees. These examples may be expanded many, many times. The point I wish to make is that if it pays for private industry to do this, and you know that it does, it certainly will pay us to take the same measures in managing our Military Establishment which has many more problems inherent in it than we find in industry.

Now let me turn to the question of economy. Although we all believe that the betterment of morale among our troops will itself result in economy, since all of us know that happy and contented workers make for better and more efficient operations, I will be the first to admit that such things are intangible and cannot be measured exactly. Therefore, I would like now to discuss those aspects of economy which this bill seeks to remedy, which can be measured. For this purpose, I have selected one of the services, the Air Force, to show you what it means to this very important first line of defense; namely, the Air Force. Your committee has found that the Air Force cannot expand any faster than it can secure trained men in the hard-core skills. In other words, mere numbers of

men are not the answer. The Air Force can only expand as fast as it can develop its hard-core skills. We find that the Air Force can secure these trained men in only two ways: First, from industry; or, second, train them itself. It goes without saying that the military cannot get such men from industry, so the second alternative to train them themselves is what is done. However, in the Air Force your committee has found that the training period is so long that not much gain is made during the first enlistment. The training pays off only if the Air Force can keep their men beyond the first enlistment. Unfortunately, unless the Air Force is able to do something to make the career service more attractive, it does not appear that they will be able to get enough enlisted men to reenlist to insure the quality of personnel that the Air Force needs. At the present time, the Air Force is set at a 137-wing program with a manning of 975,000 people. The facts developed in our hearings on this bill indicate that the Air Force must get at least from the beginning of fiscal 1955 through fiscal 1957, a reenlistment rate of 33 percent.

The reenlistment rate of 33 percent is a minimum since the Air Force does not believe, and I agree with them, that without it this country can get sufficient new enlistments to attain the total figure of 975,000.

This bill which we are presenting to you today will help the Air Force attain a higher reenlistment rate. Your committee feels that this is essential to the defense of the Nation.

Let us look at what the chances are of getting a 33 percent reenlistment rate or better, since 33 percent is an absolute minimum. In February of 1954, the Air Force had a 5 percent sample survey made. Of all airmen whose enlistments would expire during fiscal 1955, it appeared that only 26 percent indicated that they were going to reenlist. Thirty percent of the individuals due for separation in fiscal 1955 are airmen who have had more than one enlistment in the Air Force and of this group, 64 percent have indicated that they would reenlist, proving beyond a doubt that the Air Force contention that once a man has got past his first enlistment, there is a good chance of keeping him. The first termers, composed of 70 percent of the group, indicated that only 9½ percent intended to reenlist. In order to get a 33⅓ percent reenlistment rate, the Air Force must raise the number of reenlistments of these first termers to 20 percent. One of the main reasons given by the men for their unwillingness to reenlist is the lack of adequate family housing accommodations. If the Air Force is able to demonstrate to these people that it is doing everything within its power, with the assistance of the Congress, to make the military career more attractive, your committee is sure that it would be enough to tip the scales in the Air Force favor for a large percentage of them. Your committee is further convinced, after studying the problem intimately, that it is practically self-evident that our Government would in the

long run be many dollars ahead by permitting the expenditure necessary to build military family housing and other necessary facilities.

I am sure that you have all heard various dollar figures stated as being a loss to the Government when a man does not reenlist. The figures have ranged all the way to \$14,000 for an enlisted man and \$41,000 for an officer. If we disregard the above high figures and consider only the enlisted man, on the most conservative basis possible, your committee has found that the Government will lose at least the cost of training the individual. The provable minimum cost in the Air Force, which does not take into consideration intangible costs, amounts to \$2,500 per man.

As you all know, when an enlisted man leaves the service he receives certain benefits. These benefits include, among other things, mustering-out pay; lump-sum payment for accrued leave; if he is unemployed, he may be entitled to unemployment compensation in the amount of \$26 a week for 26 weeks; and he has all the rights and privileges of the GI bill of rights which includes substantial payments for education. In addition, he may receive a bonus from the State in which he resides. It would, therefore, appear that the incentives that exist are incentives to leave the military service rather than incentives to stay in the military service. Your committee recognizes that as long as we have the draft, these benefits cannot be taken away since they were established to help the serviceman make up for the losses he sustained because he entered the service of his country. These benefits, from that standpoint, serve a worthwhile purpose, but they are certainly making the job of maintaining adequate service forces difficult. I bring this matter to your specific attention because I am afraid that we have all failed to recognize the serious problems confronting our Military Establishment in retaining personnel that the country has expended thousands of dollars to train.

These benefits that I have mentioned, including the GI bill of rights benefits, are a cost to the United States that the United States would not have to pay if the man did not leave the military service. Therefore, the loss to the United States Government when an enlisted man fails to re-enlist is not only the \$2,500 training cost but was the amount of money the Government is required to pay under these benefits. Forget for the moment all benefits except the benefits for education. We find that approximately 40 percent of all Korean veterans will take some educational benefits and that the average period of education to which they will be entitled is approximately 18 months at an average cost of \$100 per month.

The Air Force provided me with two examples to support this conclusion. During 1953, the 9th Bomb Wing was reassigned from Travis Air Force Base, Calif., to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho. Mountain Home, Idaho, is approximately 60 miles from Boise, Idaho. Due to the isolated nature of

this station and lack of adequate housing facilities, no reenlistments occurred within the organization until physical evidence was presented to the airmen that the housing problem would be solved. Once the Air Force was able to show the airmen that housing was actually going up, reenlistments started to come in. This same situation was characteristic of the movement of the 42d Bomb Wing from Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex., to Limestone Air Force Base, Maine. One individual example was at March Air Force, Riverside, Calif. This is a Strategic Air Command key station. At this station, the Air Force has 3,500 families living off the station. Recently an airman reported to his commander that he either had to be assigned quarters on the station, receive an increase in pay, or seek some method of separation from the service. He was forced to occupy a set of quarters in the local community for an approximate rental, including utilities, of \$125 per month. His basic pay is \$107.02 and his quarters allowance is \$77.10. The airman pointed out that he had to give up his automobile, he had been unable to pay for adequate clothes for his youngster, and at the present time they were running out of food and had no money to buy essential food items for the remainder of the month. The commander inspected the set of quarters occupied by the airman and found them clean, quite small and though his wife and the child were spotlessly clean, they were not what you might consider well-dressed, and it was apparent that they were certainly making a definite effort to maintain some dignified standard of living. All current bills were paid, but the airman could see no solution because each month the same conditions were going to be characteristic of this case. In discussing this case with the station commander, he pointed out that he had no set of quarters that he could assign to this airman on the base, which would have helped to some extent. The only solution that he could offer in this immediate case was an outright grant from the welfare fund of the necessary funds to meet living costs for the balance of that month. Unfortunately, this is not an isolated case. Your committee has found that it is true at many stations throughout the United States. It appears, therefore, that it would be desirable to take some of the savings which might accrue from the increase of reenlistment rate to create the conditions, one of which is housing, which would make the Air Force career more attractive. This not only will save money to the Government as demonstrated above, but will also raise the quality and the morale of our forces.

Now, let us see whether all these benefits to the Government; for example, the increase of quality and the saving of training costs and GI benefits, can result without the expenditure of a large sum of money.

Under current legislation, a soldier or airman with two dependents is authorized a quarters' allowance of \$77.10, regardless of his grade or length of service. An airman with three or more depend-

ents is authorized a quarters' allowance of \$96.90, regardless of grade or length of service. Officers' allowances, under current legislation, are as follows: Second lieutenant, \$85.50; first lieutenant, \$94.20; captain, \$102.60; major, \$119.70; lieutenant colonel, \$136.80; colonel, \$136.80; general officer, \$171. Statistics indicate that the average Air Force family is comprised of 3.1 individuals.

If we make the following assumptions, namely, that one-fourth of the proposed program of housing will be designated to meet officer requirements and three-fourths enlisted requirements, therefore the construction of the proposed program will provide for a reduction in the quarters allowance appropriation of about \$12 million each year. After 14 years the property would be paid for and would continue to return to the Government money at the rate of \$12 million per year. It is estimated that the life of this housing will be 35 years. This means that after the total cost of construction has been returned to the Government the Government will save very large sums each year in addition to money saved through increasing the reenlistment rate.

To state the problem simply and concisely, this country spends many millions of dollars to construct a base and provide plant facilities, additional millions to provide up-to-date mechanical aircraft equipment, and millions to adequately train personnel and then lose the effect of the spending of the many millions by refusing to provide approximately \$5 million in family housing at a base to make the military organization at the particular base an integrated effective military force.

A B-47 aircraft costs approximately \$2 million, the training of the pilot costs approximately \$210,000, and the training of the balance of the crew and supporting specialists, to keep the aircraft and crew operating, costs approximately \$100,000. For this total outlay of \$2,310,000 per aircraft and crew, it only costs approximately \$50,000 to provide adequate family housing for essential members, thereby assuring that this aircraft and crew will remain an effective instrument of defense.

Your committee is trying to be practical and realistic about our problems relative to family housing—why we need it and where. We know, as you do, that the concepts of war have materially changed since World War II due to the development of long-range aircraft and the atomic and hydrogen bombs. The air bases have become war operational bases, both for offense and defense. All of the modern equipment and training will be of little avail in the initial stages of the next war if the men cannot reach this equipment in time to utilize it to prevent the successful accomplishment of the initial attack, if the very men whom we are relying on to man this equipment are, in too many instances, living so far from their duty post as to be ineffectual during the initial war stages. In other words, they would not be able to reach their planes in time to intercept the enemy. Certainly we do maintain alert crews, but when the chips are down and

an all-out attack is launched against our country, the Air Force wants to be able to put into the air a maximum number of fighters and bombers immediately.

Simple economy, good business, and a proper regard for our military people and their defense mission, all dictate favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield the gentleman a half minute.

Mr. SIKES. I could use much more than that time, but I asked the gentleman to yield to pay tribute to him for his zealous service in behalf of the Armed Forces. I do not know of anyone who has labored more diligently to make the military career inviting.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. I wish I had given him 5 minutes.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield, briefly.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to say I think the Department of Defense will be before the Appropriations Committee in the immediate future, because these items are urgent, particularly in the ADC and Strategic Air Commands.

Mr. RIVERS. That is an important thing.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. SAC and ADC officials informed us they need some of these houses on the base as a fireman needs to be in the firehouse ready to slide down the pole when there is a fire.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina 1 additional minute.

Mr. RIVERS. I have gone into this matter thus at length and earnestly with you because after all the important thing is to keep the serviceman happy, keep him in the service serving his country happily. That is your responsibility, that is my responsibility.

Once I think it was related by the old Duke of Marlborough that one of his soldiers said to him:

God and the soldier were adored
In time of danger, not before.
The danger past and all things righted
God is forgotten, the soldier slighted.

Now, in 1954, while time remains, we at home can reverse that in this day of world tension, waiting, as Syngman Rhee told us yesterday, waiting the call to death. Let not that be charged against us.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I want to say that during the 22 years I have been here I have not heard a matter better presented, or more sound reasoning than the gentleman from South Carolina has just given the membership of this House.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong believer in the Wherry Housing Act. I still favor Wherry housing. We need this bill, however. I will try to tell you why. However, I first want to answer a statement made a while ago of the investment that the taxpayer has in Wherry housing.

Directly, the taxpayer has no investment in Wherry housing, because it costs the taxpayer nothing originally.

The Wherry housing program operates like this: The Department of Defense at a permanent installation needs, we will say, 500 housing units. The sponsor gets a contract and builds those houses. It does not cost the Government a penny. However, the FHA guarantees the mortgage whereby the sponsor gets the money with which to build these houses. FHA guarantees it up to 90 percent. The only way the taxpayer can lose would be for the situation to develop where the rentals are not sufficient to amortize or pay out the mortgage and pay the taxes. In that event FHA has to come in and make up the shortage, but that has not happened so far.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the gentleman should point out that this money is taken out of an insurance fund.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am coming to that. The point is there is no appropriation required for Wherry housing. To this extent it is very advantageous. However, there is no getting away from the fact that in the long run Wherry housing costs much more than the housing under this bill. It was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] that a Wherry housing unit costs \$8,100 and occupied by the Government for 32 years, the Government has actually paid \$50,000 for the unit.

Under this bill the Government builds the house itself and the cost is amortized through quarters allowance for rental for the use of these units. The money goes into a revolving fund and stays with the Government. So here there is an initial appropriation.

Some mention has been made of Wherry housing abroad, and I want to touch upon that matter briefly. There is no such animal as Wherry housing abroad, but that term has been given to some housing that we have sponsored and accepted overseas. I will give you an example. In one country overseas we needed a number of units, several hundred, for military personnel. A private contractor said: "I will build those houses if you will guarantee 90 percent or 95 percent occupancy for a period of any 10 years." We said, "All right." So again there was no investment, and the only way we can lose is not to have sufficient personnel over there to keep those houses occupied for a period of 10 years. If a portion of them become unoccupied, the contractor can then lease them to private families, and we still only have to make up the difference. It was said in our committee that the only way we can lose under that arrangement is to have permanent peace and bring our troops back home. That is a price we are glad and willing to pay.

I think it should be pointed out also that Wherry housing cannot afford to be built, the sponsors cannot afford to build where there is only a small number of units. I believe the testimony shows the smallest number of units in any one place under the Wherry housing provision is 25 and generally they insist they must have 100 or more. Wherry housing makes money for the sponsors only where they build a large number. They cannot make money by building a few. One of the provisions in this bill provides for small numbers of housing units and installations where we cannot get Wherry housing. That is the only exception, where the housing sponsors will not agree to build them, anyway. Otherwise this bill provides for Government housing only in installations that are not permanent and where they do not have Wherry housing or where it is a permanent installation or where we have Wherry housing and replacements for substandard housing already built are necessary.

Mr. Chairman, strictly as a business proposition this bill represents sound policy. It involves money that one way or another would be an eventual cost of maintaining our Armed Forces. By making a capital investment now we can put some of our normal expense into permanent installations.

There is an aspect of this program which is not entirely dollars and cents. This is its importance to the creation and maintenance of a hard core of experienced and devoted career soldiers, sailors, and airmen. In separate bills from time to time, this Congress has been dealing with this general problem, and this bill is one further step in developing a program to meet fundamental needs.

A sizeable nucleus of well-trained, continuous-service personnel is essential to each of our armed services—not only to keep the service ready for the unpredictable demands which may arise in this period of tension, but also to lead the relatively untrained individuals who must augment the services in time of emergency. Such a nucleus cannot be maintained without a definite effort to make service life acceptable to the highest type of men as a way of life.

This requirement of a hard core of professionals cannot be filled by personnel without families. Even if this were possible it would not be desirable. To attain a high order of military and technical efficiency these men must serve during the years when most Americans have become heads of families. We need the stability and responsibility that is characteristic of family men.

Some of the burdens which service life imposes cannot be eliminated because they are inherent. But service families in recent years have been under handicaps which may be accepted in wartime, but cannot be endured in the long haul. They have been concentrated in many areas which are already crowded by defense activities. They have been sent to isolated locations in which the civilian facilities do not even remotely meet the needs. And, at the same time, we have concentrated our efforts on building weapons and operational installations rather than the family accommodations

which would have been considered normal in prewar years. As a result the individual service family almost as a general rule has had to choose between housing expense far beyond their means, or unsatisfactory housing. Too frequently, the only solution has been separation of the family.

This bill will not fill all of today's needs. It is at best a start, and an indication to service personnel that a measure of relief can be foreseen. It will begin the task of meeting the minimum long-term needs of the Military Establishment.

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is purely an interim measure. It is going to take care of between 10 and 14 percent of the houses needed. The bill should be passed because, as has been pointed out, there is no question as to the desirability of getting houses at our defense installations and getting them in the shortest possible time.

Someone has raised the point that the Appropriations Committee would need time to examine the matter before it passed on it; but if we get the authorization through it is an indication that the Congress and the people are interested, and the engineering can be done even if we wait until the next session of the Congress for the appropriation. It is the first step necessary to get this type of housing.

I want to make it very clear that I do not think Wherry housing is bad. The services do not like Wherry housing, but as I sense it, they do not like Wherry housing because they do not exercise the full control over it that they exercise over housing such as this. On the other hand, I am not going to condemn Wherry housing for that alone. I think it has a very definite place in the scheme and I want to make it clear that this subcommittee—I think I was as faithful in attending as anyone—heard very little evidence on the part of the Wherry people. It had no opportunity to give them a chance to meet the arguments made against Wherry housing. So, I am not going to condemn Wherry housing in any sense of the word, but that does not interfere with the necessity for this bill at this time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman is correct, that the subcommittee heard very little testimony about Wherry housing. But, is it not true that prior to that time the committee heard a lot of testimony about Wherry housing specifically?

Mr. MILLER of California. We did, but I think there are a lot of things we should go into before we abandon a scheme that was set up to try and en-

courage private money to get into this field.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We are also going to try to explore the problem a little further. It is part of our instructions to explore the problem further, and I am sure the gentleman will contribute toward that end like he has in the past.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right. This matter will be explored. We are not closing the door on Wherry or any other kind of housing, but that does not say that this 10 percent, only 10 percent, of the needs is not justified and justified at this time to try to encourage the morale factor in the services.

Let me point out that it costs \$50,000 to train a pilot, and when you lose a pilot you lose that great investment. I just received a letter this morning, and I am only going to read one part of it. It is from the wife of a master sergeant. She says:

From all indications our heart's desire to have a family is going to be held in abeyance for a few more years. Sure, we could endeavor to make a home in one of the 18-foot PHA trailers on the base, which is the only housing facility available on—

I will leave the name of the base out—for families with less than two children. But, would you ask your family to make a home in a tiny trailer that is just big enough to turn around in—the type of vehicle that most people use for vacationing?

Now, how can you expect to hold people under those conditions when the home, the most sacred thing in our American tradition, is an 18-foot trailer in a place where it is not too pleasant to live in trailers?

Mr. Chairman, I again want to further labor the argument made briefly by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] that in the Air Defense Command the men have to be available on the base so that they can scramble and get into the air and not take 20, 30, or 40 minutes to get from their homes to the base. We depend on our Air Defense Command to keep back the bombers of the enemy. We want ADC planes in the air, and warning time is only a matter of an hour or an hour and a half.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat disturbed about the presentations that are being made regarding this bill, based upon the experience and observations that I have been permitted to participate in over a period of years in connection with the military. In other words, we find that under the Republican administration, in order to save money and to permit private business to become a functional factor in our economy, that we gave birth to the Wherry Act. The Wherry Act, insofar as my observations are concerned—and I have been on every one of the projects in continental United States with the exception of Florida—have been very satisfactory if the command reports that were given to me are

correct. There were four in which the command reports were adverse, and I do not blame them, because they were cracker boxes that were built under an improper management concept, whether it be Wherry or any other housing.

I further feel that in the last minute the situation presented before the House is somewhat out of keeping with conditions. For example, I was privileged to have a copy of the original project presentations that were made by the military to the Committee on Armed Services. And in that what did I find? I found that in California, in my own congressional district, in a large Air Materiel Command base, there was a request for 154 Wherry housing units at an expenditure of some \$2.5 million or more. I called the command of that post over long-distance telephone for a clarification, because I had been on the post 2 weeks before. Their statement was that they had never made a request for that size of Wherry housing, had no use for it and had no place to put it, and had adequate housing for all other personnel in rented quarters and other housing categories, with the exception of three command houses.

Furthermore, I found in that presentation a request for housing at 29 Palms which is a Marine Corps project again partly in my congressional district and in that of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. Here is another illustration of the Wherry Act that was acquiesced in by the military and was on its way to a construction contract.

I am just wondering, gentlemen, as I look over the complete list of projects as presented in this bill, how deeply these gentlemen have gone into the authenticity of these requirements on stations that are incorporated in the bill.

In other words, what are these gentlemen attempting to do here? I should like to ask the chairman, if I may, whether it is the concept of his committee, in its wisdom to avoid any further operations under the Wherry Act?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; distinctly no.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I make one additional comment? When the gentleman's time has expired, I shall yield him an additional minute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We must naturally assume that the representatives from the Department of Defense are telling us the truth. If there is any such situation as that to which the gentleman has referred on the project in his district, I should like to look into that situation myself.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me say this to the gentleman. Somebody on the gentleman's committee looked into it because it was eliminated from the bill that we are presently considering, as compared with the original bill. Anyone who knows anything about these operations knows that these are the facts. What I am getting at is whether the information that is supplied in connection with this bill, as it affects each of these

projects falls into the same class of hypothetical assumption as do those two projects to which I have referred or are they based upon fact? If there is anybody on the committee who is prepared to tell me of their own knowledge that it is based upon fact, I should appreciate it if they would.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I represent the First Congressional District in South Carolina. We have a new air base at Charleston. They need 800 units. We gave them 500. They are building a big Marine base at Beaufort, S. C., with which I am sure the gentleman is familiar. You know what they need there; we gave them 50 units. They built a big naval hospital at Beaufort. The gentleman helped me break ground on that. I can tell the gentleman that in my district they need them. I cannot speak for anybody else. The gentleman will have to take the word of those who are representing those other districts.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sorry that the gentleman cannot assume the responsibility for giving me the same answer concerning the other projects. Let us go a little further into the matter of the requirements of the military. I am as realistic about the requirements of the military as any one man on the floor of this House. I have lived with their problems for a great many years and I have had deeply implanted in me a sympathy for their difficulties. I know what housing means to those families. I know that we have had families disrupted because there has not been adequate housing. But let me read something to the membership that might be extremely intriguing as to the whys and wherefores of losing so many of the military as we are losing. I should like to quote from an information services letter, the Air Force Information Services Letter dated June 11, 1954, volume VIII, No. 6. I shall quote this specific paragraph:

Referring to a recent informal survey of attitudes of Air Force dependents, the Secretary said it was found that 22 percent of the complaints received were remediable by the base commander, 24 percent remediable by the Department of the Air Force, and 6 percent remediable by Air Force personnel acting informally. Some 33 percent were remediable by legislation, or by governmental authority above the Air Force.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to call attention to the fact that throughout the history of our Nation we have built family quarters for members of the military with appropriated funds.

Back some years ago when we were having such tremendous difficulty in securing adequate housing for members of the Armed Forces the Wherry Act was adopted. I do not know of any understanding at that time that it had become the fixed policy of the Government that in the future all family quarters would

be built under the Wherry Act. In any event, we did build many projects under the Wherry Act and they have been most helpful. It is true that they have filled a very great need. It is also true that under the Wherry Act all bases cannot be taken care of. In the first place, you cannot take care of temporary bases, and in addition you could not possibly build a Wherry project for items such as we have in this bill or for such a small number, from 4 up to 50, and things of that kind, that would not be justified under the Wherry Act.

It is true that about 3 years ago under the previous Democratic administration the President placed an arbitrary ceiling on the military budget. When we considered the public works bill on that occasion with the necessity of coming within the arbitrary budget fixed by the Democratic administration we found it absolutely essential to remove from the public works bill all family quarters to be built with appropriated funds. We at that time stated that they should be built under the Wherry Act. Again, we did not formulate any permanent policy of the Government that we would not again build with appropriated funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How many of the projects that are delineated in the bill are in the category of the permanency declaration?

Mr. KILDAY. I will have to ask the members of the subcommittee to give me the information as to how many permanent and how many temporary stations there will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand they were all permanent, those that were designated. That is what the different departments told us, that they were permanent stations. Later I will place into the debate the specific facts.

Mr. KILDAY. In this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. The point of that is that this represents a very small number of houses relatively. It represents only approximately 13,000, and the original request from the Department was for 25,000, making it perfectly clear that that was not nearly all that was needed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I understand the gentleman, this is only a down payment; \$175 million is only a down payment on a total request for \$1,750,000,000 if this is only 10 percent of what is needed.

Mr. KILDAY. I did not use the figure of 10 percent. Someone else ahead of me did.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I thought he did. What percentage does the gentleman think it would be of the total?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know. They told us they wanted 50,000 units ultimately. They asked for 25,000, and we have given them 13,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman's re-

sponse as to permanency was that they were all permanent?

Mr. KILDAY. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If they are all permanent, there is no reason why Wherry housing could not be built insofar as the GI requirements are concerned, and a specific amount of houses for officers compatible with that decision. Is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. KILDAY. I assume it is the chairman of the subcommittee stated that that was the fact. I was not on the subcommittee. I assume the gentleman is correct in his statement.

We are bringing in here line items. The question about building Wherry housing that cannot be filled has nothing to do with this situation. We have authorized here a small number of stations out of a much larger number requested by the Department. The subcommittee took the departmental request, examined into the number of Wherry units available at those stations, the number available in the community from private housing, and the number that could be built by private industry in that area. They determined that these were houses that would not be built under any other program. You are not going to have a situation of Wherry housing projects being built that cannot be occupied. If these gentlemen from the Committee on Appropriations do what I know they are going to do in appropriating funds for these houses, you are not going to have that situation because they are again going to require that each one of those line items be justified to them. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] who preceded me and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who expressed himself while we had the rule under consideration are all members of the Committee on Appropriations and even though this authorization bill is passed, the Department will still have to go to the Committee on Appropriations and again justify by line item on each one of the items contained in this bill.

I mentioned in debate under the rule the fact that this will liquidate itself. From time immemorial, we have compensated our military personnel on the basis of pay and allowances. We have always had a quarters allowance and a ration allowance in addition to pay. The quarters allowance is fantastic in the amount of money which is involved.

I know you are in receipt of telegrams from sponsors of Wherry housing projects pointing to the fact that they are renting Wherry housing projects for less than the quarters allowance. That would indicate that there is a saving of the Government because of the fact that some of these houses are rented for less than the quarters allowance. That is not a saving to the Government. The Government must still pay out the full quarters allowance. It goes into the hands and the pockets of the military personnel. They receive it and they pay a smaller amount of rent. That is no saving to the Government. The obliga-

tion of the Government is a fixed obligation and the quarters allowance must be paid unless the Government supplies the personnel with Government quarters. This provides Government quarters. They will liquidate themselves in anywhere from 13 to 16 years. The Government will own them from the beginning. They are going to be built under competitive bids. They are not going to be built by negotiation and they are not going to be built pursuant to the approval of a project by FHA or any other agency. This does not involve the Government guaranteeing a loan where the builder would get a great deal more money than is required to build the project and consider the balance as a profit. That is a matter which is under consideration now by a committee in the other body as to these housing projects which were granted without competitive bids or by negotiation with the departments or by approval of a project submitted by one of the sponsors. These will be built by the Corps of Army Engineers for the Army and the Air Force and by the Bureau of Yards and Docks for the Navy. They must be procured under the uniform procurement act which requires competitive bids.

They are going to be built as military construction of this type is always built so that they will last practically forever. I know that many of us at times feel they build them too substantially. I know in my own district there are quarters which were built in the early 1870's, officers' quarters, which are now the preferred quarters on the post because they were built in the early days to last forever. This is in accordance with our traditional system. It takes care of an emergency situation and one which goes very deeply to the question of our ability of maintaining our professional personnel. This is something we must do before this Congress adjourns. We have difficulty in retaining this personnel. The personnel knows that the final say so as to whether there will be housing rests with this Congress. The Department of Defense has announced through many press releases a program of housing which it has requested of the Congress. Are we going to adjourn and let the word go out to members of the military personnel that, although the Defense Department did all that they could to get housing, the Congress of the United States would not let them have it? I say at the very minimum this should be done for the welfare of our military personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, no one will question the fact that additional family housing is needed for the armed services. It is true, however, the armed services were very late in making their needs known to the committee, and it is also true that the service representatives did not seem to have a proper understand-

ing of the exact needs of the respective installations when they appeared before the committee.

I do not intend to be especially critical of the items in this bill, but I do want to point out that the Armed Forces have certainly been careless of the taxpayers' money in the abandoning and building of installations throughout the United States. There are scores of camps, forts, and other types of installations which the armed services argue are greatly needed. We later find that they have abandoned these installations and then clamor for money to build more and different installations. Throughout this country these abandoned posts are monuments to careless use of the taxpayers' money.

A good example of the abandonment of one Army installation in order to utilize another is the transfer of troops from Camp Atterbury, Ind., to Camp Carson, Colo. I do not care to go into the details of the intricate maneuvering in accomplishing this change. But I do want to point out that when the 31st Division was moved from Camp Atterbury to Camp Carson, Army officials stated they had ample barracks at Camp Carson and would not need additional funds. I was surprised a few months ago when, contrary to its previous statement, the Army in hearings on H. R. 8726, asked for \$7 million for additional barracks at Camp Carson.

This is merely one example of the careless manner in which the Army is spending the taxpayers' money in building new installations in this country at the same time they are abandoning others.

I want to especially bring to the attention of the Committee the fact that in many instances the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy work at cross purposes and certainly do not work as members of the same team. Although the services cannot find any use for some of their installations they are extremely reluctant to allow others, especially another service branch, to make use of the installation. I have made some effort to get a list of the various abandoned, unused military and naval installations in the country and I have asked each service which of these installations they would be willing to allow one of the other services to use. They admit that they have no use for such installations, but they refuse to allow another branch to use it without a recapture clause.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this recapture clause, as used between the services, is costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars. In effect this recapture clause means if this service wants to use this installation again they can immediately take it away from the service to which they have loaned it. For example: If there is an Army base that cost \$50 million of the taxpayers' money and the Army has abandoned it, and if, for example, the Air Force wants to use these facilities, construct runways, and use it as an airbase, the Air Force does so at its own peril, for the Army retains the right to "recapture" this base for its own use. Naturally the Air Force will not take over this base under such an agreement for then

the 12 or 15 million dollars the Air Force would spend on runways and modifications would be lost when the Army demands recapture of the installation.

I believe the Secretary of Defense is doing a fine job. He has brought about many economies and has greatly improved the Armed Services. But I do want to point out that this field of making proper utilization of abandoned military bases is most important, and a proper control of the matter and the prevention of one service from being a "dog in a manger" in keeping another service from using an abandoned base should command the careful attention of the Defense Department. I have brought this matter informally to the attention of various members of the Defense Department, and I intend to bring it to their attention more forcefully in the future.

I want to also call attention to a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES], which would require an inventory of all Government property, the amount of money which such property originally cost the Government, and its present value. I believe such an inventory should be made, and its facts would be of great interest to this body, and might also influence the armed services policies in regard to unwanted and unused installations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to correct a misstatement which I gave to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], when he asked me if these bases were all permanent. I find that the Army units provided here are permanent and the Navy units provided here are permanent. But all of the United States Air Force, especially the AEC stations, are not permanent. They are temporary stations, and they are a very small fraction of the total amount. This is a more specific answer to the question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

I would like to pay my compliments to the members of the subcommittee who served with me. We had a very difficult job. Our views sometimes differed. Everybody was congenial, cooperative, and generous. In all the decisions we made, although we started out with different viewpoints, we finally arrived at a unanimous decision. We had a very difficult and complicated situation before us. We were pressed for time, because the Congress was coming to a close. It was a great pleasure to work with all these men, and I want them to know how much I appreciate their cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, in this matter we must remember that the people to whom we are most anxious to furnish houses are the sergeants and junior officers, the first and second lieutenants. They are the ones who fly the planes. They are the ones who do much to furnish leadership in the Navy and Army, and build morale in the lower echelon of command. If their morale is good, then the morale will be good all the way up. You must have good morale at every level, but the ones in the lower units, the enlisted men, the company officers and field officers are the

ones who come in contact with the enemy. They are the ones who liquidate the enemy. They are the ones who really win the wars. Of course, we include the field officers and all the way up to the top, but we must always keep in mind that the ones who win the wars are the ones who meet the enemy and liquidate the enemy. We cannot come out second place in a war if we are to survive. We must win if we are to survive.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Where in the bill is the limitation on the personnel to whom this housing is going? You say it is for first and second lieutenants and the enlisted men. Where do we find that in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, it was testified in the hearings. I cannot go into the details, but they told us just what they were for in each item in the bill. Nine thousand, specifically, of the thirteen thousand were for enlisted men. Of the others a great proportion goes to the junior officers, and a smaller proportion to the field officers.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in the bill to prevent a major or a colonel or a lieutenant colonel from taking over quarters assigned previously to a first or second lieutenant?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is an administrative problem. There is nothing to stop that. But what we are trying to do in this bill is to bolster the morale and retain the services of these officers personally who really win the war.

I do hope that the House will look with favor on this bill. As has been pointed out by myself and others, this takes care of only 10 percent of the projected need for housing. We are not going into the question of projected need; we are looking at the situation as we see it today and in the future, maybe a decade at least; and we are trying to provide the security that the country demands and needs by doing something for those who may have to win the war for us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask why you have done nothing for Massachusetts with the exception of the Air Force installation at Otis?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I cannot answer that. We did not do anything by States. We are taking the projects that we were told were considered as being most seriously in need of housing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was there any recommendation for the air field at Bedford?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the committee did not specify the sites of these projects that were presented to us. The various services came before us and said these were the most critical places where such housing was needed right now to start this whole project going.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Most critical?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Most critical, yes.
Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. COON. I notice that the airport at Beal was recommended for 236 units. I was told the other day by a gentleman who visited the Pentagon that the Pentagon was undecided as to whether it was going to keep Beal as a permanent installation or nonpermanent. Can the gentleman answer as to why this project was allowed for Beal?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The answer is that we were informed there was this need for housing there and that it was a permanent base.

Mr. COON. They did state it was a permanent base?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, under the rule all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop military installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land, as follows:

Continental United States

(Third Army area)

Fort Campbell, Ky.: 325 units of family housing, \$4,906,000.

(Fourth Army area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: 272 units of family housing, \$3,845,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: 639 units of family housing, \$9,548,000.

(Fifth Army area)

Camp Carson, Colo.: 1,447 units of family housing, \$21,508,000.

Camp Crowder, Mo.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,106,000.

(Sixth Army area)

Fort Lewis, Wash.: 1,110 units of family housing, \$16,450,000.

Camp Cooke (U. S. Disciplinary Barracks), Calif.: 50 units of family housing, \$737,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: 20 units of family housing, \$297,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Belie Mead General Depot, N. J.: 10 units of family housing, \$176,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: 30 units of family housing, \$499,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: 208 units of family housing, \$3,102,000.

Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Virginia: 10 units of family housing, \$168,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Va.: 306 units of family housing, \$4,460,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Va.: 271 units of family housing, \$4,065,000.

Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, North Carolina: 4 units of family housing, \$77,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$178,000.

(Armed Forces special weapons project)

Sandia Base, N. Mex.: 3 units of family housing, \$88,000.

Killeen Base, Tex.: 5 units of family housing, \$110,000.

(Tactical sites)

Various locations: 300 units of family housing, \$4,433,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which comes at page 3, line 9. I am going to combine what I might say on the bill as a whole, with what I have to say on that amendment, and it would be appreciated if I could get an opportunity to offer that so I could discuss the bill before everybody else on the floor has had a chance to offer amendments and discuss the bill; so I am constrained to object, unless that can be understood.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a matter entirely within the hands of the Chair.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

(The Clerk continued the reading.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the Chair recognize Members who have amendments or those who have pro forma amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize members of the committee to offer amendments.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the need for housing has been one of the most serious factors affecting the personnel of the Nation's Armed Forces. I feel that this committee should be commended for its effort toward alleviating this very serious problem. It is a situation which has dealt particularly adversely with the younger officers of the armed services and with the enlisted personnel. So I think the Nation generally will welcome the efforts that are being made here to correct in part—and this is only a beginning—that serious problem.

I take this time primarily to ask for more information about the proposal which is brought here by the Committee on Armed Services of the House and, if I might have the attention of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California, who is chairman of the subcommittee, I would like to ask him at this time who will build the housing proposed in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It will be under the regular procurement system. There will be competitive bidding, the bidder must qualify substantially by putting up a bond and so forth.

Mr. SIKES. Then all bidders who are qualified will be eligible to compete and presumably the award will be made to the lowest responsible bidder in each case?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman tell me who will operate this housing after it is built? Will it be the persons who build the houses or will it be the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It will be the Government, the particular branch of the service that the particular station involves.

Mr. SIKES. After the houses are built and occupied, who will own the houses?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The United States Government will own the houses, just like it does on all permanent stations like the Presidio of San Francisco, for instance.

Mr. SIKES. Then this is a return, as I understand it, to the old type of military housing which was constructed on military bases prior to World War II in which the Government built the houses through competitive bids, operated the housing for the benefit of military personnel, and owned the housing units.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct. This is the traditional way that we built houses for the military from the inception of the Republic up to the Second World War.

Mr. SIKES. Undoubtedly there are areas where many people will welcome a return to that policy. This, then, has no relation to the Wherry Act which has been used for a number of years in order to provide housing for military personnel?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It has not. In my opinion, this does not affect or injure the Wherry housing program.

Mr. SIKES. There is an additional question I would like to ask the gentleman, and I appreciate his courtesy in answering these questions. A number of communities have felt that they are qualified to provide sufficient housing to provide for military personnel through FHA, and that it is not necessary in those communities for the Government to build, operate, and own housing. Has the gentleman's committee gone thoroughly into the possibility of having needed housing for military personnel constructed by private builders through FHA?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We did not go into that, but in every project submitted to us it was preceded by an investigation of the particular military branch involved as to the available rental houses in nearby communities that could be used by the servicemen.

Mr. SIKES. Then is the gentleman telling me that the availability of FHA housing and other private housing has been carefully screened and that this measure is intended only to relieve the most acute housing problems now existing where there is not sufficient existing housing in nearby communities?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to say that the subcommittee was charged with two jobs: One was to get a bill out for emergency housing, which is this bill. Then it has a further study to work on in the future on the overall policy, to wit, everything the gentleman from Florida has inquired about, and make recommendations as to a permanent policy or plan. That is work to be done next year. This is an interim bill, an interim piece of legislation, to take care of emergency needs right now.

Mr. SIKES. I have been told repeatedly that the number of houses that are provided in this measure will take care only of a part of present emergency needs.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Ten percent of the peacetime requirements and only 50 percent of what the military authorities now declare to be essential. They asked for \$350 million, and it has been reduced to \$175 million.

Mr. SIKES. In the event that additional privately owned housing is made available through FHA or through other means in the communities adjacent to the military bases which are affected by this bill, will there be a corresponding reduction of the housing units carried in this program for those bases?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. So far as possible, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In the event that private owners or FHA build houses in cities adjacent to bases, we are not going to abandon the houses on the bases and have the military rent houses in the cities away from the bases.

Mr. SIKES. That was not the purpose of my inquiry. My inquiry was, if there should be houses available, will you still build the military houses provided in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. That is what I said. The availability of houses was presented in every single instance, and we considered that, before we made a specific authorization of each group in this bill.

Mr. SIKES. You have taken that into consideration in drafting the bill. But, will you continue to take it into consideration until the contracts actually are let for this housing so that private builders will be encouraged to provide housing where possible?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand it will be continued.

Mr. SIKES. That information will be helpful to communities throughout the country.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly in opposition to pro forma amendment in order to make a comment in connection with the questions raised by the gentleman from Florida. One of the things that has been insisted upon, I might say to the gentleman, in connection with this question of supply of houses has been that there be an accurate determination as to the availability of private rental housing in the surrounding community. There have been times when I have felt that in-

formation submitted was not entirely accurate or complete; but insofar as the committee was able to secure that information and insofar as the military are able to provide it, the requirements for family housing on specific installations was reduced by the amount of satisfactory rental units available within commuting distance of the post. We are concerned with total housing availability, including publicly owned quarters, Wherry projects, and privately owned accommodations.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 3, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the reason that I did what I did not like to do, a minute ago when I objected to the unanimous consent request—and I hope my friends on the committee are not offended—is that I thought I could save time by talking on this amendment and talking on the general subject of the bill at the same time.

I think there is a misunderstanding about the bill. There is some misunderstanding, perhaps, on both sides. I think it can be cleared up. I think the record that is being made today will go a long distance toward clearing up some of the points I believe are at issue.

First of all, frankly, I do not see any urgency in this bill. I do not see the necessity of having this bill here today. I think it might have waited in the committee until January and then come out, after having had more study given to it.

I should like to make clear my own personal interest in it. I am the chairman of the committee that puts up the money for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I see my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] over here, and other members of my subcommittee. Our committee has the money for FNMA. We are seriously concerned with the effect of this bill, as it is presented, upon the integrity of mortgages which have been issued, to the extent of \$1,400,000,000.

How did this come about? During the years when we needed all the money that we could get for defense, for the actual war, it was decided that if private industry would build these houses, we would take advantage of that. That was the Wherry Act, so called. The contractors went out and built these houses. They have their money invested in them. By a slip of the tongue, in colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], I said that the taxpayers had their money in it. What I meant was that the taxpayers would otherwise have had their money in it. It would have gone beyond the debt limit. Actually, this would have thrown us beyond the debt limit, if that had been possible. Therefore, this bill is extremely important. The taxpayers have, however, guaranteed the \$1½ billion, through FNMA.

The first draft of this bill contained a long list of projects, as the gentlemen from the committee have indicated today. I was personally familiar with some of those projects. There was one project across the river in Arizona, which I was

familiar with personally. On that project, the commanding officer said, less than a year ago, that he did not need additional houses. I see that that project was stricken out of the revised bill.

There was one to which my colleague from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] referred, that is mostly in his district, and some of the land is over in my district. There was \$1 million that was to be spent for housing at that place, but it was pointed out to the committee that they had already let contracts on which there were 5 contractors bidding, and that they had already let contracts under the Wherry Act to build there. So the committee struck that out.

Then there was a case at the Norton Air Base, that my friend from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] also mentioned. A telephone call to the commanding officer at that base brought out the fact that he had not asked for any houses. That was stricken out. Then there was one at Pittsburgh where a great many houses were available in the city. There are 50 or more houses in this bill. There were houses provided for that base and some of them were left in.

In other words, there has not been the detail work on this subject, for this bill, that it should have.

There was one case up in Utah. My knowledge of that is personal. I had to go down, with the contractors, to the HHFA authorities and get permission to delay the first payments so that they could use their own money to remodel the houses, in order that they might be occupied, from the plans originally given them by the Chemical Corps.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is referring to the Dugway project?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. It is my understanding that there were 400 units of Wherry housing constructed at Dugway originally.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I understand so.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Of that number, it is my understanding that for at least a year there were over 200 vacancies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Because of the original plans of the Chemical Corp. Those were corrected. Those were remodeled at the expense of the contractors. There are still 17 vacancies. I am told the contractors are willing to build more if necessary. The point is, if we build a lot of \$15,000 and \$20,000 houses, there will be a suction that will take people out of the Wherry-plan houses.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PHILLIPS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would like to get the situation before you, because I think there are solutions that can be adopted here today.

Dugway is a good example. There was a project put up with private money which I am very sure will have the FNMA mortgages jeopardized and the investments jeopardized if this bill goes through. My amendment strikes out lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 3 to meet that issue.

Let us see about the other objections. First of all, let us take up the Appropriations Committee's objection. I think that has been pretty well cleared up. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will accept the statement that it is not intended to bypass the Appropriations Committee, although the report on page 7 indicates that that was the earlier intention. I take it that is cleared up, so we pass that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That was before the cuts were made by the Appropriations Committee. As of the date we wrote the report, that was the correct statement. We concede that it does not pertain now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I take the gentleman's word that it is the intention that the authorization shall go to the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Committee shall appropriate the money.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is the routine process. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then let us take a look at this matter of whether these houses are for generals or for privates. My friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] says we have to do something for the enlisted men. There is not a particle of objection to that part of the conversation. We have to have houses for enlisted men; we have to have more houses, and the military has to build a lot of them. There is no controversy on that point. The point at issue here is whether we shall take the taxpayers' money to pay for housing which could be built by private money, and, second, whether we shall jeopardize the money already invested by contractors, and make FNMA pick up the money, which throws it back on the taxpayers.

Here is one unit at Barstow, which is in the district of my friend here; \$27,000 for that house. Ten units at Oakland, in the city of Oakland. Why do we build houses in the city of Oakland at \$15,200 apiece? Two units at Coronado, at \$23,650 apiece. Are those for privates? No, they are for generals. Go ahead and build houses for generals.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. What is the gentleman's interpretation from the presentations that have been made today as to how many GI's will be benefited by this housing as compared with noncommissioned officers and officers, under this authority?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not know. This calls for 13,000 houses. I do not think we have that many generals and admirals ready to move in, but if it is so, let them move in, but let us build them where we really need them for the enlisted men.

Here is the startling thing, and I am glad the gentleman brought that up. It

is now said this bill covers only 10 percent of what is needed, which means we are really talking about a need for a billion dollars to be spent out of the taxpayers' money, when it could probably be spent out of the money of private builders.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman raised the question about Oakland. I want to point out that there is a naval hospital at Oakland, Calif., 10 units for \$152,000. That is \$15,200 a unit, and that is the company-grade officer type of unit. These are for the doctors at Oak Knoll Hospital, and if the gentleman is familiar with the location in Oakland, Calif., of the Oak Knoll Hospital, he knows it is located in an area of very high residential values. These are the young doctors, the lieutenants who have to be on the job and do the ward work at the hospital 24 hours a day.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have no objection to these doctors having nice houses, but I still think we do not want to jeopardize the Wherry investment. Do not forget we put an \$8,000 limit on what the Wherry contractors can build. We say they can build a house for \$8,100, but then we say you have to have houses costing \$16,000. If you will strike out this project, which I happen to know about, if you can do that—and there may be others that other people know about—then I may not have to go down myself to the HHFA, and straighten out what otherwise would be a severe financial loss to the Treasury of the United States. Secondly, if the committee will offer an amendment, which I understand is at the desk, which clears up this matter of whether or not we are going to be in competition with Wherry projects, and put these houses where there are Wherry houses available, and in that way again jeopardize the Government's investment and throw it back on the Treasury; and third, I am willing to accept the statement of the gentleman from California, and other Members, that this will go under routine procedure through the Committee on Appropriations, then it seems to me we have wiped out a great deal of the argument here today, although I still think the proper place for the bill is back in the committee for more study.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course, we are going to have a great deal of opposition from the Wherry housing people on any building of quarters anywhere. As a matter of fact, they have gone to quite an extreme. I received a letter the other day, which I would like to quote in part:

We do state and represent to you and call to your attention the fact that this procedure "which is the time-honored traditional way of providing housing," which could only be inspired by Communist thinking—

Now, when the Wherry housing people go to that extreme, I wonder why they do it?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to complete my statement, please.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman tell us who wrote the letter—what firm wrote the letter?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not care to do that.

Mr. Chairman, let us find out why we do not favor more Wherry housing. As I said, when we were talking on the rule, actually we cannot get sponsors for Wherry housing in many places. Strangely enough, when Wherry housing started in 1949 we had 12 projects approved. In 1950, we had 65. In 1951, we had 83, and in 1952 we had 64. In 1953, we had 55 projects approved. Strangely enough, however, in the first half of that year, we had 52 projects approved. But in the second half of the year, only 3 projects were approved. I wonder why we did not have more sponsors for projects. In the middle of 1953, we passed Public Law 94, which required a cost certification upon which we would base the Federal Government's guaranty of the mortgages. I do not know whether that had anything to do with it or not, but so far in this half of 1954, we have only gotten 12 units approved. I would like to direct my remarks to the Dugway Proving Ground. The suggestion has been made that we have not, as a subcommittee, gone into this proposition very thoroughly. The objectors to having any additional building there are the people from the Wherry housing projects, where we have 400 units. We have taken into consideration Wherry housing, title IX, FHA insured, and rentals other than title IX, and the Lanham Act housing. We know we will have a peacetime need for a certain number of units, and we subtract the number of Wherry housing units available and we come up with a deficit of 544 units that are absolutely needed for the peacetime number of officers and men that we will have stationed at Dugway.

I cannot for the life of me see why the Wherry housing people are objecting to this traditional type of financing of our Government housing. It has been brought out time and again that actually we are going to save money, and when we amortize these houses through the traditional way of doing it, Uncle Sam will have something he can put his finger on. Under the Wherry plan, we get title to them in some cases after 50 years and in some 75 years. I wonder what type of housing we will have at the end of that time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no question about it, the military forces need far more housing than they now have. I have looked over your report and I fail to find it in there. Is there a limitation on the cost of any of the types of houses to be constructed under this bill?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes. We have a limitation.

Mr. THOMAS. Will you give it to us, please?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. THOMAS, Mr. DEVEREUX was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

For enlisted men we have a limit of \$12,850 per unit.

Mr. THOMAS. How many bedrooms is that?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am informed 2 or 3 bedrooms, although I do not have definite information.

Mr. THOMAS. A 2-bedroom house built on Government property at \$12 850?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS. That is pretty expensive housing. That does not include the cost of the land, because you assume the Government already owns it. That is approximately \$15,000 for 2 bedrooms.

Mr. DEVEREUX. For company grade officers it is \$15,000; for field grade, \$20,250; and for general grade \$27,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Page 404 of the act, it says "Not to exceed 250 of these family units shall have a net floor area not to exceed 2,100 square feet." It is the number of square feet that we put into this housing that determines whether they are company grade or field grade. So that this limitation on the number of square feet that go into the houses will determine the limitation.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Texas asked that question. I have been trying to do it for an hour or so. That does not tell us how much these units will cost, built on Government property.

Mr. DEVEREUX. What is the value of the land on Government property. That would have to be considered. There apparently seems to be some objection to a general officer having a house that costs \$27,000. A general officer has quarters allowance of \$171 a month. At that rate it is normal to expect that the housing would be amortized in around 20 years.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. First of all, I do not think anybody is going to object to general officers having suitable houses, but what we are talking about is units for enlisted men.

The gentleman said the Wherry contractors would not build any more houses. I am under the impression that they have not been asked to, and I know the members of the committee did not give the Wherry people a chance to be heard on the bill as it is now before us. On the original bill they expressed themselves, and deletions resulted, but on the

consideration of the bill the second time there was, if the gentleman remembers, a quorum call of the House and the subcommittee never did get back to the hearing again. So the people involved have not had a chance to express themselves on the present bill.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I will agree to that but I am sure the gentleman from California will agree that in this particular case where there is a demonstrated need for 544 houses and only 30 are to be built, certainly that is not going to impair the integrity of the Government's guaranty.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sorry, but I do feel just that. As a matter of fact there are 17 vacancies right now. If you build 30 houses now at Dugway it will be like a vacuum. The tenants will be sucked out, not from the cities, but out of existing units on the project.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman does not have the figures that we have. At the present time we have 58 officers, 575 enlisted men, and 990 civilians, a total of 1,623. But shortly we will have a peacetime complement of 139 officers, 673 enlisted men, and the same number of civilians. Therefore the people who are saying that their investment might be jeopardized do not have the facts and figures. We do have the facts and figures as presented to this committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Did not the committee say to the contractors you would let them build additional houses?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the Dugway situation. Reference to page 5589 of the hearings will show that at the time the bill was first read there were 60 units in the bill. The gentleman from Iowa and I got into a colloquy and we agreed to halve it, so we came up with 30 units.

I would like to say to my colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] that I do not think he has to worry very much about building 30 units at Dugway or that it will have a great deal of effect on the situation at Dugway because, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX], has said, the need out there is far greater than can be filled. I therefore agree with him that this is one of the best places for additional housing and that we should do something.

There are some 17 or 20 vacancies at Dugway and at some place in the hearings it was brought out that these were in the 3-bedroom units, that when the project was built it was the military that guessed wrong as to the number and type of units that should be put in. The sponsor has told me that he is willing to make those large three-room units into smaller units by subdividing them if the military will agree to it. So I cannot hang any bouquets on the Army as far as Dugway is concerned.

While I am not going to vote for the amendment I say that I think the situation now will cause the thing to be looked into.

I would like to say to my friend, my good friend from southern California that I think when he introduced ancillary things into this such as the housing at Oakland he was not himself too well posted, because this is in the heart of a big city, and \$15,000 for a company officer type home in a big city would not produce a gorgeous creation. These are for the doctors, the young lieutenants, and lieutenants junior grade who have to be on hand 24 hours a day to meet the emergencies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will say that I did not know that they were for doctors. If they are for the doctors, it is all right. They are not the type of housing for enlisted men which the committee is talking about?

Mr. MILLER of California. No. At this installation, just as at other hospital installations, you will find nearly all of them are for doctors and wherever they are for doctors they are company officer type houses.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In the survey here I thought there were 10 units for the naval supply center?

Mr. MILLER of California. There are. I was talking about the 10 units at the Oakland hospital.

Mr. YOUNGER. And there are also 10 units for the naval supply center?

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman wants to go into that, if he is familiar with the location of the naval supply center, he knows it is removed at one end of Oakland where you have to go through a great industrial district and if he will look at the request it is for \$152,000, which is \$15,200 apiece, for the lower-grade company officers, the lower officers who have to be on the base to best serve the base. These are not for commanders, lieutenant commanders, or admirals. These are for the working officers on the base.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Can the gentleman tell us how far it is from downtown Oakland to the hospital?

Mr. MILLER of California. It is so far from downtown Oakland that when the Government was going to abandon it at one time and we thought we could get it for a veterans' hospital, the doctors who serve as consultants at the veterans' hospital in Oakland told us that it is so far out they would not be interested in going out to this hospital because they lost too much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. (By unanimous consent Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. There seems to be some misunderstanding of this problem of whether the housing is

for enlisted men or officers. It has been brought out previously that it is for both. I think we should probably be interested in the figures. Approximately 8,993 of these units are for enlisted men and approximately 4,612 are for officers. Many of these line items in the bill admittedly are for commanding officers' quarters on various posts. I do not see anything wrong with providing satisfactory quarters for the key officers, the commanding officers, and the executive officers, at the various permanent installations that we have. Certainly these units are going to be amortized by the housing allowance that will not be paid to the officers if they occupy these houses. I certainly do not want to get into a hassle here over enlisted men and officers.

Mr. MILLER of California. If you will read section 404 you will see that only 10 percent of them are in excess of 2,000 square feet, which are for the top officers' quarters. Most of them are under 1,200 square feet.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS:

"SEC. 406. Notwithstanding the authority granted in titles I, II, and III of this act, no family house units shall be constructed at any installation at which there is a housing project constructed pursuant to title VIII of the National Housing Act, or at any installation where the Federal Housing Administration has issued a commitment for the construction of such project: *Provided, however,* That the limitation contained in this section shall not apply with respect to those family units which constitute a replacement of existing substandard housing units, nor to those projects involving not more than five units at an installation.

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the construction of housing under title VIII of the National Housing Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this may not be a substitute amendment, and perhaps it should appear at the end of the bill. We are doing nothing to hamper or injure Wherry housing. The gentleman from California indicated that if this amendment was adopted, he would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that was not what I understood, but maybe we might do that. I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] to say that he would accept this amendment; then that could be voted on, and then he would offer his amendment, which, in my opinion, goes a long way toward settling all of the discussion we have had today. If the gentleman from California will simply indicate his willingness to accept the amendment that I put in at the top of page 3 and then offer his, I think we will have practically concluded all of the discussion today. Is the gentleman from California willing to do that?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what I tried to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] withdraw his amendment for the time being and vote on the Phillips amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is that the correct thing to do?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be the proper procedure.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thought the bill was open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. That was objected to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert some figures to add to the ones the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] gave a short time ago.

In this bill there are 8,993 units for enlisted men; for company-grade officers, 3,053 units; for field-grade officers, 830 units, making a total of 12,876 out of the 13,613 that the bill provides for by the justifications made for each department. It, also, specifically provides that there shall be not to exceed 250 houses for general officers—section 404.

I would also like to have the RECORD show that the cost per unit of these houses is as follows: For enlisted men, \$12,850; for company-grade officers, \$15,200; for field-grade officers, \$20,250; and for general officers, \$27,000.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, line 14, change the period to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided,* That before any of the units at this installation are constructed the Secretary of Defense shall determine the extent to which the public housing designated as project VA44061 (Ferguson Park) will satisfy the housing requirement herein provided for, and this authorization shall be reduced accordingly."

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am in thorough sympathy with this bill. We need to provide additional houses.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and I have prepared a considerable amount of information in connection with it which I will not put in the RECORD unless it becomes necessary. This amendment is offered because I do not believe that in this particular situation the Army took into consideration some of the available housing in that general community. Within about 15 miles of Fort Eustis there is located a housing project built with Lanham Act funds by the Navy in World War II. That project has a large number of vacancies. I am told it is in good condition. It has a number of one- and two-bedroom units in it. It is not located on Fort Eustis proper. It is about 15 miles

distant. But it is at the intersection of 2 major United States highways which connect with Fort Eustis.

The statement was made that in considering the housing available in the community, housing within 30 minutes commuting distance was considered.

Apparently this particular housing was not considered. At the present time there are 419 vacancies on this project. One hundred and seventy-six military families live on the project now, most of whom come from Fort Eustis.

My contention is that with 419 vacancies, the need for housing at Fort Eustis to house enlisted men who are eligible for occupancy of these quarters cannot be very great.

I have proposed by this amendment that the Secretary of Defense make a finding as to the extent to which the housing in this particular unit meets the requirement for housing at Fort Eustis and to the extent that the Secretary of Defense finds that vacant housing does meet the requirement for housing provided in this bill then this authorization shall be reduced.

In a situation of this kind I think positive action should be taken by the Secretary of Defense and if there is satisfactory housing available within 15 miles we ought not to duplicate it by building new housing on the post.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment to be specifically addressed to Fort Eustis, without reference to other projects in the bill?

Mr. HARDY. It addresses itself only to Fort Eustis because it relates specifically to one Lanham Act project of which I have some personal knowledge.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman, if it is good in this particular instance, because inaccurate information was given the committee, or an incomplete survey was made, why would not this action apply equally well to other situations in the same or similar condition?

Mr. HARDY. I think there may be other situations similar to this. However, there were a great many of these Lanham Act projects which are very substandard and which are not suitable for occupancy by families of our enlisted men. I would not want to suggest that housing of such nature be taken to replace housing proposed to be constructed under this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the gentleman is right with this reservation. It need not necessarily apply only to Lanham Act housing. It could apply to any other construction which, taking into account its usability, might be considered.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman is really repeating in his suggestion, the proposition that he discussed a little earlier, is he not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right. It is a question of available housing.

Mr. HARDY. That is taken into account. In this particular situation this housing is 15 miles from the post. Apparently it was not considered because

it is slightly beyond, or somebody thought it was slightly beyond the 30-minute commuting distance. That is the key to it. If I understand the position of the gentleman from California, it is that all available housing should be included in the surveys and that there should be no duplication by construction on military reservations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is my point.

Mr. HARDY. That is supposed to be done now. I believe the military are making conscientious efforts to do that, within a 30-minute commuting area.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to oppose this amendment for I think a lot of the gentleman who has offered it. However, this would make a pattern we cannot afford to set. Further, I think the rules now in effect with reference to the housing he is talking about would prohibit what he wants to do.

The gentleman was kind enough to tell me he was going to offer this amendment, so I looked into the matter and obtained some information about it which I am going to read into the RECORD, relating to the project the gentleman mentioned.

This is a typical war housing project known as Ferguson Park, which contains 1,186 units of temporary construction, one-half 1-bedroom units with 523 square feet of gross space, and one-half 2-bedroom units with 620 square feet of gross space. They rent for \$45 and \$51 per month, respectively, exclusive of heating oil which adds approximately \$100 per year to the rent.

Under PHA rules, no Army personnel may occupy this housing above the grade of corporal.

Our law provides largely for sergeants and junior officers.

During peak traffic periods, it requires approximately 45 minutes to cover the 16 miles distance between the project and Fort Eustis in a private automobile. Travel by commercial means requires a longer period of time.

The apartments are generally the same standard as other war housing. The kitchen is so small the refrigerator must be placed in the dining space. There is not room in the dining space to accommodate a table and four chairs. Storage space in the kitchen consists of a cabinet below the sink and one 10-inch by 30-inch cabinet above the sink.

Information received from the mayor of Warwick, Va., indicates that the city would like to have this housing destroyed. In accordance with PHA policy for Lanham Act housing, this substandard housing was constructed for war workers for the emergency period and was to be demolished, inactivated, or sold to private interests at the earliest practicable date.

You can see from the foregoing that the Department of the Army cannot consider such housing as assets for its permanent requirements at Fort Eustis.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I must say to the gentleman from California that he evidently has secured his information from the Army, while I secured mine from the Housing Administration, because they certainly do not tally at all. I can pro-

duce a full plan of the project if the gentleman would be interested. I am advised that this housing is not in the kind of condition the gentleman from California has indicated, but even if it is, the amendment I have offered could not possibly do any harm because it simply requires that the Secretary of Defense make a finding with respect to the extent to which it would be suitable to replace the housing provided for in this bill. There certainly cannot be any objection to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Others would want to do the same thing and we would have this so hopelessly tied up we could not do anything.

Mr. HARDY. If there are other conditions where there is housing which is suitable to replace the housing proposed in this bill, then the bill ought to be amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think these are suitable houses for enlisted men.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon about the necessity for this housing, and perhaps some housing is needed from the standpoint of the career military service.

Let me say that housing is not the only thing that enters into whether a man stays in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps. I can recall a case or two, and well after the Korean war started, when fliers were compelled to fly bombers in Korea with obsolete equipment. Those fliers got out of the service after they got out of Korea.

Also I know of a case where a boy enlisted in the Air Force. He was a nationally known athlete, with two degrees from a university of this country. He took the officer-candidate examination and passed, but he was denied admittance and, as far as I know, still is denied admittance to the officer-candidate school, and he will not be in the service beyond his enlistment because he was an inch short of the minimum height for an officer. That is a regulation and an unbelievable one. He was tall enough to enlist in the Air Force and tall enough to be accepted for service in the ranks, but he was not all enough to be an officer in the United States Air Force. Now do not tell me that the career service hinges entirely on housing. As to the permanency of some of these bases, they are just about as permanent as a change of mind and a decision to abandon a base. We have in the State of Iowa, and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] well knows that we have a base in our State where the buildings are of permanent brick construction, which today is completely idle. Yet it is proposed here to build new homes for officers for \$27,000 or more.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for the remarks he has made. He is referring, of course, to the Fort Des Moines Army base, is he not?

Mr. GROSS. No; I am referring to the base at Ottumwa, Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thought the gentleman was referring to the Fort Des Moines Army base. But I will take the base at Ottumwa. I, too, wish these people could be quartered. But unfortunately to use the houses or buildings there for the quartering of officers would not be of any value to our military services because they are not needed there.

Mr. GROSS. Not needed where?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At Ottumwa, Iowa, because there is no base activated there today.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure they are needed at the Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am quite sure they are but for a different reason.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; for quite a different reason. That is what I am trying to say: We are doing a lot of political building in this defense setup, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The base to which the gentleman is referring is not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am aware of that but I expect it will be in a similar bill in the future.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I was going to make the remark that according to the qualifications for officers in the United States Army, General Funston and Napoleon and King Pepin would not be able to qualify.

Mr. GROSS. I will let the gentleman answer that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I deny that statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the committee ought to write into this bill a provision that the quarters proposed to be constructed for enlisted men and officers be delineated, that is, set forth in language that anyone can understand, in the law, the number of units to be occupied by each category. I am unwilling to leave it to administrative officers. Why do you not put a provision in the bill to spell it out and say that is what is to be done?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would agree with such a provision myself if it would do any good. But it will not do any good because the gentleman knows from time immemorial, officers and even enlisted men and noncommissioned officers have quarters allowances. They get that money if there is no housing provided for them, they can take it and go into town and rent anything they want to. But they get the money anyway. The gentleman's point is a good point, but it would not mean anything if it was put in the bill. It would not accomplish anything because this goes on a quarters allowance basis. The Govern-

ment furnishes the quarters when it has the buildings to do so. If the Government does not have the buildings, the men get the money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, but the point I am trying to make to my colleague is that there should be clear language in the law that is proposed to be enacted by this bill that the housing units that are constructed for enlisted men be occupied by enlisted men. I insist that a mere differentiation in floor space, as set forth in this bill, is not enough. I want the housing units which you say you are going to construct for enlisted men absolutely earmarked for these men and their families.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the amendment for the information of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARDY) there were—ayes 42, noes 20.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for no other purpose than to issue a warning to the Members on both sides. I have no amendment to offer to this legislation, and I do not want anything I say to lead anyone to believe that I am opposed to the building of these family units.

I happen to have been chairman of your special subcommittee charged with providing housing in impacted school districts along about the time this first Wherry idea of building houses on federally owned bases came along.

In the first year of the operation of our federally impacted school legislation, nearly a billion dollars of contracts were authorized under the Wherry housing plan. I am sure everybody understands thoroughly what we mean by the Wherry housing plan.

In reading this legislation, I can see you are proceeding to build these units under the provisions of the original Wherry Act, Public Law 245. The Federal Government owned the land, of course, on which these units were built. It was the first time it had ever gone into the proposition of renting to private individuals Government-owned land for the purpose of building housing units, and letting them out on a 50-year or a 99-year lease basis. They are exempt from taxation, to start with; and in setting up these rental charges, they make provision for taking care of everything, the cost of constructing the streets, the sidewalks, fire protection, the water system, garbage removal, and they forgot all about the children.

In these bases I look over in this bill only a few bases presently provide for any school facilities at all. When you talk about building millions of dollars of housing, there naturally follows school children to be educated, and you are making no more provision than they made in the original Wherry Act.

What I am saying to you is to put you on guard that you are creating another situation in handling these impacted school district propositions. You have a small base where you are going to build 50 or 75 or 100 units. There is no federally owned school building on that base. You will impact every school district that touches that base. Those children have to go to school. What provision are you making for educating those children? You take care of everything and forget about the boys and girls. I would like both the majority and minority members of this Committee to express themselves.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not feel that this is any part of this bill. I am very much in favor with the gentlemen's views so far as impacted areas are concerned. As the gentleman from West Virginia knows, I have gone along with him repeatedly in taking care of those things.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want anything I might have said today to create the impression to the other members of the committee that I am opposed to building these housing units; it is perfectly all right. I am just calling your attention to a problem you are going to set up for the Congress to take care of with no provision to meet it in this bill, these additionally impacted children. I am simply pointing out that situation. I was not talking to you about not building these units but simply telling you about the headache you are going to have.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill may be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The remainder of the bill reads as follows:)

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop military installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$13,254,000.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and the acquisition of land as follows:

Continental United States

(1st Naval District)

Naval hospital, Newport, R. I.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

(3d Naval District)

Naval hospital, St. Albans, N. Y.: 10 units of family housing, \$151,900.

(4th Naval District)

Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.: 25 units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

(5th Naval District)

Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: 50 units of family housing, \$642,500.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, N. C.: 35 units of family housing, \$473,300.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va. (Skiffes Creek Annex): 5 units of family housing, \$91,200.

(6th Naval District)

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla.: 95 units of family housing, \$1,272,900.

Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Fla.: 30 units of family housing, \$397,300.

Naval air station, Key West, Fla.: 20 units of family housing, \$273,900.

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: 83 units of family housing, \$1,085,400.

Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Fla.: 25 units of family housing, \$343,100.

Naval hospital, Pensacola, Fla.: 25 units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval supply corps school, Athens, Ga.: 30 units of family housing, \$456,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Glynnco, Ga.: 83 units of family housing, \$1,115,900.

Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Miss.: 7 units of family housing, \$102,100.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.: 185 units of family housing, \$2,546,900.

Naval hospital, Beaufort, S. C.: 50 units of family housing, \$654,300.

(8th Naval District)

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.: 80 units of family housing, \$1,096,900.

(11th Naval District)

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif.: Two units of family housing, \$47,300.

Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.: Fifteen units of family housing, \$204,500.

Naval hospital, San Diego, Calif.: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Twelfth Naval District)

Naval hospital, Oakland, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, Calif.: 50 units of family housing, \$666,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.: 60 units of family housing, \$787,500.

(Potomac River Naval Command)

Naval hospital, Bethesda, Md.: 30 units of family housing, \$409,000.

Naval district area: 4 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Ga.: 119 units of family housing, \$1,595,700.

Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, Calif.: 1 unit of family housing, \$27,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.: 12 units of family housing, \$173,400.

Marine Corps school, Quantico, Va.: 332 units of family housing, \$4,730,300.

Outside Continental United States

(Atlantic Ocean area)

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: 45 units of family housing, \$595,100.

Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: 100 units of family housing, \$1,379,000.

Naval air activities, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: 175 units of family housing, \$2,366,300.

(Pacific Ocean area)

Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: 175 units of family housing, \$2,312,600.

Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: 2 units of family housing, \$30,400.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$1,218,300.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

Continental United States
(Strategic Air Command)

Sedalia Air Force Base, Mo.: 418 units of family housing, \$6,042,450.
Altus Air Force Base, Okla.: 370 units of family housing, \$5,340,950.
Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.: 443 units of family housing, \$6,397,300.
Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kans.: 293 units of family housing, \$4,230,850.
Dow Air Force Base, Maine: 305 units of family housing, \$4,401,850.
Lake Charles Air Force Base, La.: 253 units of family housing, \$3,651,650.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.
Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.
Great Falls Air Force Base, Mont.: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.
Hunter Air Force Base, Ga.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.
Larson Air Force Base, Wash.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.
Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.
Mather Air Force Base, Calif.: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: 4 units of family housing, \$81,000.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nev.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.
Travis Air Force Base, Calif.: 6 units of family housing, \$128,250.

(Air Defense Command)

Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y.: 111 units of family housing, \$1,602,450.
Otis Air Force Base, Mass.: 230 units of family housing, \$3,324,850.
Newcastle County Airport, Del.: 108 units of family housing, \$1,559,200.
Truax Air Force Base, Wis.: 111 units of family housing, \$1,602,450.
Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.: 94 units of family housing, \$1,355,100.
Paine Air Force Base, Wash.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,069,200.
Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,069,200.
Ent Air Force Base, Colo.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,444,300.
Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.
Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pa.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.
Niagara Municipal Airport, N. Y.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.
Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport, Minn.: 74 units of family housing, \$1,069,200.
Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.: 111 units of family housing, \$1,602,450.
Geiger Field, Wash.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.
Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.
Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: 53 units of family housing, \$763,050.
McGee-Tyson Airport, Tenn.: 57 units of family housing, \$824,200.

Portland International Airport, Oreg.: 63 units of family housing, \$906,000.

Minot area, North Dakota: 71 units of family housing, \$1,028,300.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.: 51 units of family housing, \$735,000.

(Tactical Air Command)

Clovis Air Force Base, N. Mex.: 185 units of family housing, \$2,671,650.

Hurlburt Air Force Base, Fla.: 295 units of family housing, \$4,259,900.

Foster Air Force Base, Tex.: 222 units of family housing, \$3,202,550.

McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, S. C.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

(Air Training Command)

Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.: 133 units of family housing, \$1,921,450.

Laredo Air Force Base, Tex.: 112 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

Gary Air Force Base, Tex.: 112 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex.: 166 units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

Greenville Air Force Base, Miss.: 129 units of family housing, \$1,860,300.

Moody Air Force Base, Ga.: 148 units of family housing, \$2,138,400.

Stead Air Force Base, Nev.: 92 units of family housing, \$1,329,400.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.: 166 units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

Webb Air Force Base, Tex.: 92 units of family housing, \$1,329,400.

Parks Air Force Base, Calif.: 92 units of family housing, \$1,329,400.

(Military Air Transport Service)

Charleston Air Force Base, S. C.: 504 units of family housing, \$7,285,000.

(Continental Air Command)

Beale Air Force Base, Calif.: 236 units of family housing, \$3,406,650.

(Research and Development Command)

Kirtland Air Force Base, N. M.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$4,250,000.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further development of military, naval, and Air Force installations and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this act without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The authority to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works shall include authority to acquire lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$175 million to carry out the purposes of titles I, II, and III of this act.

SEC. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 percent, but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this act.

SEC. 404. Not to exceed 250 of the units of family quarters constructed under the

authority of titles I, II, and III of this act shall have a net floor area of not to exceed 2,100 square feet. None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed by this act shall have a net floor area in excess of 1,250 square feet, and the average net floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed 1,080 square feet.

SEC. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction or rehabilitation work authorized by this act, including administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

SEC. 406. Whenever—

(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this act; and

(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH: Page 14, line 22, after the period insert "Provided, That none of this appropriation may be used to construct family quarters on any military base where existing family quarters are sufficient to meet the needs of such military base or can be constructed under title 8 of the National Housing Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the gentleman's amendment identical to the one I presented to the Clerk a while ago?

Mr. McDONOUGH. This is in order now, as the gentleman's amendment has not been read.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It was read.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then if the chairman has an amendment I ask that mine be considered as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing pending before the Committee, except the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then I stand on my amendment as submitted as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the gentleman knows whether or not his amendment is identical with mine I would not object to his.

Mr. McDONOUGH. No; I cannot go so far as that, for the reason that the gentleman's amendment does not contain the provision in the last sentence of my amendment that no housing shall be constructed where title 8 of the National Housing Act housing can be constructed. The gentleman does not provide that in his amendment, as I understand.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In other words, Wherry housing would have priority over any other housing under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Where there is sufficient family quarters on a base, of course, no housing would be needed. But where Wherry housing can be constructed on the base then my amendment would provide that Wherry housing should be considered first.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Considered and take precedence over any traditional method of furnishing housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I just wanted to get the matter clear.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It would have to be certified that Wherry housing could not be constructed on the base; there must be a certificate that Wherry housing is not eligible for construction.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Basically it gives preference to Wherry housing.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman's amendment proposes that in a situation such as we will suppose might exist at Quantico Marine Base down here at Triangle, should they decide to build 300 units of housing, it could not be proceeded with under this bill until the Secretary of Defense certified that it was not possible to construct Wherry housing at the Quantico project.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Where it can be constructed. My amendment states, "where it can be constructed under title 8 of the National Housing Act." If it is not certified that Wherry housing cannot be constructed there, then construction could not proceed under this act. But where it can be constructed the act says it should be.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I cannot yield further. I have not said a word about my amendment yet.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is merely to assure that there is not a blank check given to the Defense Department to build military housing as the \$175 million proposed in the bill would provide, and that where Wherry housing can be constructed on a base it should be constructed, and, of course, where it is not certified it will not be constructed.

There have been some 78,000 Wherry housing units constructed on various military bases throughout the country at a much less cost than if those same 78,000 units had been constructed under the proposal that this bill would outline. In other words, I have figures to show that if 78,000 Wherry units now on bases across the country had been constructed under the same terms as the present bill provides, it would have cost \$1,140,000,000 to build. The cost of the 78,000 units that were built was assumed by private investment and by mortgages. There are in California, for instance, some 12,000 units of Wherry housing on military bases that have an obligation of some \$98 million in mortgages. There is undoubtedly evidence in this bill that some of the bases on which those Wherry housing units are now built will have other units built in surplus of the units

that now exist, and will jeopardize that investment.

I think that the people who have assumed the obligation of building military units under the Wherry Act in the past ought to be given some consideration and that this bill should provide that their investment shall not be seriously affected by the additional units that this bill will provide.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. Will he point out to the committee in what specific place we have jeopardized the investment of the Wherry housing people?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I cannot do that because you have not built any houses yet. I do not know what you are going to do with the \$175 million you are asking for.

Mr. DEVEREUX. It is right in the bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. You mention item by item the units you propose to build and insofar as an analysis of every one of those units is concerned, I can show you where there are places where you propose to build where Wherry units now exist.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Granted, but that will not necessarily jeopardize the Wherry units.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to make certain of it, and if the committee wants to be fair it will accept the amendment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. Chairman, we are coming down to the question of whether or not we are going to go back to our traditional way of building houses or whether we are going on and giving to the Wherry housing people a complete monopoly over any housing that may be constructed in the vicinity of or on a base. For the life of me I cannot understand why the people do not realize on what dangerous ground we might be embarking. Perhaps it was necessary some years ago. I was not a Member here and I know nothing about the motivating facts except as brought out, that they did not want to provide for housing in the traditional way for fear we would go above our debt limit. But if you people will listen to some of the things that are going on in the other body and realize what has happened insofar as FHA is concerned, and then encourage that sort of practice, it is beyond me to understand.

The gentleman has suggested that the Wherry housing projects would be jeopardized. The other gentleman from California was able to put through an amendment for the Dugway Base to pull these projects out for fear that the 30 units we propose to construct there will jeopardize the Wherry housing project that is there now when we have a demonstrated need for 544 houses.

I ask you please to consider this very thoroughly before you vote on it.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. In the testimony that was offered, did not the people who testified indicate that the Wherry housing was not considered when there was 50 percent of the demonstrated need in a given area, that that was part of the criteria that decided whether Wherry housing was needed or not?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe that is correct.

Mr. WILSON of California. If there is more than 50 percent taken care of, no additional Wherry units could be built at any given post. I do not believe that 50 percent is enough to take care of the demonstrated need. We should go beyond the amount allowed under the current provisions.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In order to be certain that there is no surplus housing on the bases, can the gentleman inform me, from the information he has, in regard to this? With 1,200 units on Fort Campbell, Ky., you are asking for 325 additional units. Does the gentleman know whether the 1,200 units are fully occupied or how many vacancies there are on this base?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would like to inform the gentleman that 312 of those units are replacements of substandard housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. At Clovis, N. Mex., you have 760 units and you are asking for an additional 185 units. Does the gentleman know how many of these 760 units are vacant, or are they all filled?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I will get that information for the gentleman. At Clovis Air Force Base 185 are replacements for substandard housing. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McDONOUGH. So far as replacement is concerned. The gentleman means inadequate housing now on the base?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Substandard housing now on the base.

Mr. McDONOUGH. How many of the remainder are vacant, if any?

Mr. DEVEREUX. At Clovis we will replace Lanham Housing Act housing. The deficit, for instance, at Clovis is now 749.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What does the gentleman mean by deficit? I am asking how many of these 760 units are vacant.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not have any figure indicating any of them being vacant.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Are they all occupied?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Unless some of the substandard quarters have been declared inadequate. I can visualize that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, the gentleman cannot tell me how many of these 760 are occupied or vacant?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Well, they are either all occupied, assigned quarters, or they are so substandard that they were not considered adequate quarters.

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, there has never been a commitment made that we were adopting the Wherry Act as the permanent policy of the Government for the construction of family quarters on military bases. The bill now before us does nothing to repeal the Wherry Act nor does it do anything to militate against the Wherry Act or Wherry Act projects. I believe that that is proper. Just the same, I believe that it is highly improper in this bill to do anything to give the Wherry Act a monopoly in the construction of family quarters.

A hasty reading of the amendment indicates that that is what it does. The first impression is that it says you cannot build any of these quarters if there are adequate quarters presently existing on the base. Then it says you cannot build any of these quarters if they can be built under title 8 of the Housing Act. That being true, if that is exactly what it means, then the Wherry Act has a monopoly in the construction of military family quarters. But, if you read the amendment carefully, it is far worse than that. The amendment which was read at the desk a moment ago, proposed by the gentleman from California—we had not as yet reached that point in the bill and he can offer it immediately after this—would take care of the situation in an orderly and proper manner. But the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] is in such form that it would completely cripple this bill. It would practically say that under no circumstances can you build any quarters provided in this bill, because here is the language:

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I should like to concur in what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. KILDAY—

Provided, That none of this appropriation may be used to construct family quarters on any military base where existing family quarters are sufficient to meet the needs on such military base or can be constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act.

It does not say who is going to determine whether the quarters are adequate. It does not provide whether you are going to have to go into court with an injunction to prevent the building of these houses or whether it would be impossible to go into court to do it. It does not provide that the Secretary must find that existing quarters are inadequate. It produces a situation which is administratively impossible to handle. That is the question of determining the adequacy of the quarters. Let us go to the Wherry Act provisions of the amend-

ment: "or can be constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act."

I take it that Wherry Act housing can be constructed on any base designated as permanent. But I do not think it will be built unless you get a sponsor, unless the sponsor's plan is approved and unless the project is requested, so that no matter what you may think as to whether you should give the Wherry Act builders a monopoly, you cannot possibly adopt this amendment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California so that he may tell me what his amendment does.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman has referred to my amendment as having to do with the question of adequacy of quarters on the base. The amendment does not say that. It says "sufficient." So far as the question of sufficiency is concerned that is certainly easy to determine. If everyone who requires family quarters on the base has family quarters, then they do not need any more. If you need any additional Wherry housing it can be built on the base, so what is the need of providing any other program?

Mr. KILDAY. I think the gentleman has missed my point entirely.

Mr. McDONOUGH. No; I have not.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to know who is going to determine whether the housing on the base is sufficient. If you attempt to build houses under this bill with funds appropriated by the Congress under this bill, would that still be subject to an injunction on the ground that there are already sufficient quarters on that base? Or is that going to be something that the Secretary of the particular service concerned is going to have to certify; that the available housing is insufficient; or is the Secretary of Defense going to certify that it is insufficient? I point out that this is not administratively possible. It cannot be administered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KILDAY was permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that he wants to build surplus houses on bases where there are already sufficient quarters? Anyone who has any knowledge of sufficiency of quarters can see whether or not families are properly quartered.

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot yield further at this time. Certainly I do not want to build any unnecessary quarters. We have so many places where quarters are desperately needed. I want every one of these houses to go where it is needed. I doubt that there are many people who think that the quarters are sufficient, existing quarters. Even the general on the base probably thinks that he can use better quarters.

I am pointing out that never before have I seen an amendment, in the Con-

gress of the United States, which attempts to put the availability of quarters or anything else on the basis of sufficiency, without saying who is going to determine whether they are sufficient. I say also as to the Wherry Act where the gentleman's amendment says "or can be constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act" that it has been provided that at no permanent base can you build any quarters under this bill, because Wherry Act housing can be built on any permanent base. But it will not be built unless the project is requested, unless there is a sponsor who submits a plan which is accepted and commitment is made by FHA to go ahead. So no matter what the gentleman from California may be attempting to accomplish by this amendment, he might just as well provide that none of the quarters provided in this bill shall at any time be built.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: On page 16, following line 3, add the following new section:

"SEC. 407. Notwithstanding the authority granted in titles I, II and III of this act, no family house units shall be constructed at any installation at which there is a housing project constructed pursuant to title VIII of the National Housing Act, or at any installation where the Federal Housing Administration has issued a commitment for the construction of such project. *Provided, however,* That the limitation contained in this section shall not apply with respect to those family units which constitute a replacement of existing substandard housing units, nor to those projects involving not more than 5 units at an installation.

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the construction of housing under title VIII of the National Housing Act."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is self-evident. I think it is a very good amendment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I must say it is not self-evident to me. I would like to ask my chairman if he would be kind enough to explain it a little bit further. Does he mean that on a base where we have a Wherry housing project now existing we cannot build any of the housing provided in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not my understanding of the amendment. It simply is that we are doing nothing to impede installation of Wherry housing in the event they go through the procedure they are required to go through to build.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but that is not my understanding of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we can make our decision right now whether or not we are going to have Wherry veto the will of this Congress. It is because we abdicated our responsibility in the first instance that we got Wherry housing in this country. Had the Congress attended to its business and done the thing it is charged to do in the Constitution, to provide an adequate military, we would never have 78,000 Wherry housing projects in this country now. Nobody sitting in any seat in this Congress now knows whether there were windfalls in the construction of these Wherry houses. It has been said by some Members of the other body, I think Senator CAPEHART, that there have been windfalls in these Wherry housing projects. How do you know? Who are you, or who am I to say that Wherry should veto the will of this Congress?

The amendment was not cleared by us. You can go ahead and say, if you want to, as to Quantico, the only school the Marine Corps has, that if we got a Wherry housing project at Quantico you could not build one single, solitary project at Quantico. I am not going to sit here and have the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] veto this bill and approve or disapprove of the things we are doing. You can do as you please, but RIVERS will not follow you. I am not going to sit here and have the Wherry association say we are Communist inspired as some one wrote to the distinguished marine hero, JIM DEVEREUX.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am with the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. The idea of trying to tell us, that we who wrote this bill were inspired by Communists or that this bill was inspired by Communists. Why we are trying to provide for your flesh and blood. If you want this bill vetoed by the Wherry association, that is up to you. I am not going to be a party to it consciously. I am not going to be a party to gutting this bill on which we have spent days and days and days in order to provide for our military the minimum of what they need.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman advise us whether or not this amendment is a committee amendment?

Mr. RIVERS. No, it is not a committee amendment. I am not going to be a party to it. This bill is the minimum of what we need for 3 million people in the military. We need 150,000 units and we are here with 15,000 units, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is approving and disapproving every single solitary thing that we are doing and I just ain't no longer going to take it.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment merely draws a line on whether we shall have Wherry units only or some other units built with appropriated funds. As I understand the amendment, and I think I understand it, if I can understand the English lan-

guage, there is a small naval installation right now under construction in my district where it is proposed to build 33 Wherry housing units. There are at the present time no housing units in that project. This will be one of the smallest of the Wherry units, and as I understand the language in that amendment, not a single housing unit could be built with appropriated funds. I mean, that is, if we adopt that as a policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not my understanding. My understanding is that the bill provides for houses by appropriated funds. But we want to make it clear that if they want to build some houses under the Wherry plan and comply with the requirements, which they must comply with, we want to make certain that our bill does not stand in the way.

Mr. HARDY. May I say to the gentleman from California, I cannot help but agree with his intent, but he certainly has not properly read and does not understand his amendment. The amendment does not do what the gentleman from California says he plans to do.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to point out that under title A, they would have to be at the mercy of the FHA down there. This thing will hamstring and gut and destroy the whole concept of this bill.

Mr. HARDY. Of course it will. We embarked upon a program of building housing under the Wherry proposal, and we have built a great many. I do not want to do anything to jeopardize those that we have already built.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course we do not.

Mr. HARDY. I am not in favor of continuing a policy of providing housing for the military which is going to cost twice as much as it ought to cost, which is what we are doing under the Wherry Act.

Mr. RIVERS. And it takes you 50 years—50 years for the Government to even have an opportunity to own these houses.

Mr. HARDY. I do not want to jeopardize the existing projects. I certainly do not want the sponsors of existing projects to suffer because of the building of houses with appropriated funds. At the same time I am not willing for a sponsor of a Wherry act housing project to say, "No, you still need some over there, but we are not going to let you build them because there might be one vacant in our project."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Only for this reason, I read this for the first time a few moments ago, and it reads to me like the same thing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is trying to do, which requires somebody to make sure the houses are needed. That is all it refers to.

Mr. HARDY. I do not understand it that way at all.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It says further that they can build housing projects only with appropriated funds.

Mr. HARDY. I cannot agree with the gentleman's interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I think we ought to understand one thing very definitely. While we are talking about Wherry housing, that is probably the most expensive housing that we could get into anywhere at all.

Mr. HARDY. Of course, it is.

Mr. DEVEREUX. It costs much more to the Government. So simply in the interest of the Federal Government and in the interest of the taxpayers of this country, we ought to abandon Wherry housing, as I see the picture today. Let us not make any mistake about that.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, and I think the time is right now to go back to the procedure of building these houses with appropriated funds because it is the cheapest way to do it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. This bill has been carefully considered by the full committee for many months. It was carefully screened by a subcommittee on programs and policies. It still has to go before the Appropriations Committee, and it is my opinion that the bill should be left just as it was reported from the committee, without any amendment that might muddy up the whole structure.

Mr. HARDY. Certainly this amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make the observation that my understanding of this bill is completely in line with the very pertinent, forceful, and timely observation made by my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

I followed this bill in committee. When the recommendations first came up to the committee, it was recognized that the Department had to act hastily and to meet an emergency situation that exists. It is a real emergency, because involved is the question of reenlistment and the keeping in service of career men. We know the tremendous expense to the taxpayers when reenlistments drop off. When this bill came up, it was hastily prepared. That is no reflection on the Department. I think it is safe to say that the bill in its original form did not have much chance of passing. I was kept informed of the progress of the consideration of the bill by members of the committee. This bill is the result of careful consideration and hard work, primarily on the part of members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, to which the whole matter was referred. This bill comes before us very carefully screened; screened by men on both sides, both Republicans and Democrats, whom we all respect; men who constituted the subcommittee. They went into it very, very carefully.

It came out of the full committee, men whom we all respect.

I am fearful, knowing my friend from California as I do, and his wholesome state of mind—I am fearful that the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, will disturb the effective work done by the subcommittee. Certainly we can all support this bill. If the amendment is adopted, I am doubtful if I could support the bill. I think the amendment will put a limitation upon what the subcommittee intended and what the full committee intended, and what we intend, and what is necessary to insure the effective carrying out of this bill.

I understand the situation among our officers and enlisted men is terrible, in some respects, in relation to housing. They are given a certain allowance and they cannot get quarters. They live outside, and the cost is so much that it has resulted in the separation of families, the wife and children in many families going home to live with their folks, and the husband, the enlisted man or the officer, remaining at his station. Those are all matters that have an effect upon men who love the service, feeling, because of the economic angle, that they cannot afford to reenlist.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. There are thousands of young men who might make the service their career, in the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, but they are not staying in the service because of the housing conditions that prevail. This bill has been screened carefully, to the point where there is only 10 percent of the required necessary housing units to be built, a very small number. Certainly it would be encouraging to these men who intend to make the service their career, that the Congress has awakened to the fact that this housing situation is a serious one, and they are going to support this program and then give very careful consideration to the overall program which is to follow. This bill should pass as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I wonder whether there is any assurance in this bill that there will be one unit built for an enlisted man? It is my understanding that there is not any such assurance.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield that I may reply?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe section 404 of the bill sets up the criteria.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield further, nothing therein provides that it shall be for enlisted men; it can be used by officers.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is quite true.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Do you have an amendment that maybe will correct that?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. The report gives the basis on which the committee made its decision, gives the breakdown figures which have already been given which will assure that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota, that the committee has received a breakdown just like the Appropriations Committee when they grant a lump-sum appropriation for the construction of a certain project; they have a breakdown as to what the money is going to be used for.

As I understand, the greater part of these housing units is for enlisted personnel.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. But there is no assurance of that.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that any military installation housing is divided on a percentage basis among enlisted personnel and commissioned personnel. This bill applies to both enlisted and commissioned personnel.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was the basis of my answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. These figures were put in the RECORD some time ago by the chairman, there are to be 8,993 units for enlisted men; 3,000 for company-grade officers, 830 for field-grade officers, and 78 for generals and commanding officers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Cannot an officer and his wife live in 1,250 square feet of space? That is the only restriction contained in this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. My very good friend, whom I greatly admire, honestly—

Mr. McCORMACK. I think he is really satisfied.

Mr. GAVIN. He asked for one unit. The one unit I was interested in, the greater Pittsburgh air base, 33 of the 57 units are for enlisted men, the others for officers; but I emphasize the fact that 33 out of 57 are for ground force men.

Mr. GROSS. But that is a breakdown proposition. Again, the officer there can assign the quarters.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the committee has looked into all of those aspects. It is not written in the bill, but we know that in the course of ordinary consideration the committee has been advised. If they did not live up to the provisions of the bill the committee

would quickly subject them to appropriate treatment.

Mr. DEVEREUX. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can satisfy the gentleman from Iowa. For instance, picking at random from the backup material, I have an item of a Navy base in Florida which specifically states: "25 units for enlisted men. Five units for company-grade officers." That is just in the backup material.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no doubt that the subcommittee has done a remarkable job and that there has been very careful screening of the projects to be undertaken. We have the necessity. I was very glad to note the other day that the second proposed cut in the Army in the fiscal year 1956 is not going to take place. I have vigorously opposed any reduction in the Army with the world situation as it exists today, with the world killers, the Communists, trying to overrun the world. So there is more need for the construction of these units, and, as I said, I am very glad to see that the proposed reduction in the Army in the fiscal year 1956 is not going to take place.

I am fearful that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be harmful to the bill—not intentionally so, of course. A rejection of the amendment would be no reflection on the gentleman because he is offering it personally and I observe from questions asked that he has probably some doubt himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for the complimentary remarks he has made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mean it, too, because the gentleman and I have worked on other matters. We have conspired constructively together.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is not any doubt in my mind about the clarity of the amendment. It will not muddy the waters, in my opinion, and I do not believe many people will be confused.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am confused and plenty of others are confused. It would be more pleasant to us if the gentleman would withdraw the amendment. If he does not do that, I urge that the amendment be defeated in order to protect the bill. Defeat of the amendment would be no reflection on the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ST. GEORGE: On page 8, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I wish again to reiterate the fact that I am entirely in favor of this legislation. I have both West Point and Stewart Field in my district and I am aware of the

necessity, in fact, of the crying need, for quarters for enlisted men and officer personnel.

My amendment would simply cut out \$2,366,300 for 175 units of family housing at Port Lyautey, French Morocco.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware of the fact that since the committee held hearings a great deal of water has gone under the bridge. We have seen the collapse of the French in Indochina; we have seen the fall of Vietnam. It is rather obvious that a great deal of our materiel was left there and has been seized by the Communists. Now the war clouds are gathering over north Africa and it is just as well we face the fact instead of assuming our usual attitude of always expecting the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

There is going to be trouble in north Africa. For that reason, first of all, I question the advisability of sending families to north Africa at this time. I do not think it is a suitable place for families to live. The war is cold at the present time. It is going to get increasingly hot.

Another thing, if you construct \$2 million worth of housing there, you will run a very good risk of having it also seized by the Communists or by the enemy in north Africa. For that reason it seems to me reasonable and not exaggerated to ask that the amendment be adopted; that this matter be kept in abeyance for, say, 6 months or a year until we can see exactly what is going to happen in the world. After that, perhaps, we may be fortunate enough to see peace ahead and be able to send the families to north Africa and to construct these 175 units.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to accept this amendment for that reason. It is not offered in any criticism of the work of the committee or in criticism of the bill. It simply is postponing for a little while until we have an opportunity to look into the situation and to become fully cognizant of what is going to happen. We have lost a great deal already, and for that reason I would rather see that we do not lose any more.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the gentlewoman's amendment refer to the situation in French Morocco?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. No, Mr. Chairman, it only refers to Port Lyautey, French Morocco. The other housing projects outside of the continental limits I think are very vital and I would not interfere with them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentlewoman realize that Port Lyautey is a very vital part of our military defense in the Mediterranean?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have absolutely no doubt about it. I am not interfering with that in any way, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does she not know that many of the families are there already?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I presume they are living somewhere.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes, and they are living off of the base, out in the community of Port Lyautey.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think the quarters should be very temporary, I will say, because I think it is very likely that they will have to evacuate those quarters. I do not think it will hurt to wait a year before we go all out with a full-fledged plan and build this huge encampment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Well, these quarters cannot possibly be constructed within a year and a half.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I know. But why start them now and have them seized before they are finished? I do not want to see that, either. It may be a gloomy point of view, but we have been bitten quite often, and the burnt child fears the fire, although that is not the usual attitude for this House to adopt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, here is what I wanted to point out. There will be very little done on this project for at least 6 months and perhaps considerably longer. If the gentlewoman only wanted it to stay in abeyance, I suggest she wait and then next spring go to the Committee on Appropriations. All these items have to be presented to the Committee on Appropriations, and at that time maybe we will have a clearer idea as to what the situation is going to be. The plea for these projects, without going into the details, was very convincing to every one of us. I think they are essential at the present time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. If it is a question of going in 6 months or a year from now and asking the Committee on Appropriations to do something about it, why could not the distinguished members of this committee do that and not pass on it now in such a hurry?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We want to get the authorization, and then she would have a chance to go up there and object and indicate to them some of the things she has told us today. Maybe she would be able to convince them.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think the bill is so good that I want to perfect it, and I think this amendment would be a step in that direction.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It may be that if we took this out we would have a hard time to put it back in again.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I doubt that. After a year from now if there is peace in the world, which we all pray for, I think it would be a simple matter to restore this small amount. After all, it is a small amount. It is just the principle of the thing, may I say to the gentleman, which is very bad.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Should the gentlewoman's amendment be accepted, could that then be interpreted that we are going to move out of North Africa?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Certainly not. It does not mean that you are going to move out of the frontline trenches simply because you are not sending the women and children in there, I hope.

Mr. DEVEREUX. As a matter of fact, if we could have them on the base, they would be much safer in the event of any disturbance over there.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, I do not think that they should be there at all. May I say to the gentleman when I was in Korea—and I do not think the situation in Korea at the present time is very much more serious than in North Africa—I was told by General Taylor that none of the wives or children are going to be under his command for some time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Port Lyautey is a very important factor in the military function of this country in the Mediterranean area. It is primarily a Navy installation. The mission of this Navy installation is to support aircraft and for that reason requires highly skilled officers and enlisted men to operate and maintain such planes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does not this station tie in not only with our efforts in Morocco but also with our efforts in the Mediterranean where we have the 6th Fleet?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am coming to that. The type of officer or enlisted man who is stationed at Port Lyautey is generally in the grade of those who can take their family with them. Many of the officers and men stationed there today have their families, some living in quarters on the station and others living in quarters off the station.

In addition to the naval air station at Lyautey, there is also a communications station that is very important in the communications system of the military of our Government. The Port Lyautey naval air station and communications center, as the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has mentioned, supports the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, and without it the 6th Fleet would not be as effective as it is today.

Therefore, the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Certainly reserving the right to examine into the details of this item at a later date by our subcommittee, let me say that we have already gone into French Morocco on such a scale and have made such commitments there that I should think it would be a mistake to draw the line on an item of this kind.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Definitely.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the authorization should remain in the bill for the time being and we can make decisions later on.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly. The Committee on Appropriations will have the opportunity to review this later on. Port Lyautey is not up against the front door of Casablanca. Port Lyautey is one of several installations of the United States military in northern Morocco, and each have security arrangements to protect the base, equipment, and American military personnel stationed there.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Would the gentleman tell me when this bill was marked up, or when final hearings on it were held?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. As I recall it, it was early this year.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It is true, probably, is it not, that the bill was marked up before the Geneva conference. Would not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Does not the gentleman think, in all fairness, that our thinking on a great many subjects should have changed since that conference took place? If we are just to close our eyes to everything that has happened and go on our merry way, that is one thing, but I do not think that is the way to legislate at this time. I think conditions are a little too serious for that.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In reply to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may I say that if the planning of our military must be altered every time a conference is held somewhere in the world involving the Communists our military will have no plans when an emergency occurs.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. We have not had any conferences like the conference at Geneva; and I certainly hope that we do not have any more. After all, that conference changed a great many things, and certainly the gentleman will agree that it was a triumph for the Communist cause. Therefore, we have got to look at the situation again, we have got to reappraise our whole policy.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In my opinion, we have had too many conferences already. I think the amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ST. GEORGE) there were—ayes 21, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Kansas: On page 9, after line 15, insert the following:

"Forbes Air Force Base, Kans.: 25 units of family housing, \$337,500."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are just two amendments remaining to be considered. The bill has been considered as read. I wonder if we might agree that all debate on these two amendments be closed in 15 minutes, so that we could finish up the bill

at that time. I submit that as a unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read to you a telegram I received yesterday from the real-estate board at Topeka, Kans. As we all know, the real-estate people have been against Federal housing in every form, and they were against this, but they have changed their mind in one instance. This is their wire:

The officers of the Topeka Real Estate Board urge you to do all in your power to see that at least 25 housing units be put back in the bill, which the House Armed Services Committee deleted, for permanent housing at Forbes Air Base at Topeka, Kans., for essential key personnel.

Not knowing how the commander at the airbase would feel about this, I called up Forbes Air Base at 10 o'clock this morning and talked with the general in command. I asked him whether it would be all right with him if I monitored our conversation and reported to this body verbatim what he would say to me. These are his words:

We have no quarters on the base for a number of our key personnel. We need them for squadron commanders, wing commanders, and other key personnel who are needed on the post. What the air base had planned on originally was 157 units which were deleted from the bill. What I am hoping to get now is enough housing for key officers whose jobs require them to be right here at the station. Right now I could easily justify 25 housing units for key officers at Forbes. I believe one of the reasons you were asked by the Real Estate Board of Topeka to try to get the 25 additional housing units was that the real estate people had taken a stand against us. At my request they have taken a new look at the problem and have agreed that they were wrong in the beginning and wanted to come out with this new statement. I have some \$2½ million planes flying, and often quick decisions are needed. Officers living on the post could be reached immediately, whereas if they were living in the city of Topeka it might be hard to locate them. In certain instances it could mean the life or death of the crew or the saving of an airplane. It is a wise investment and it makes sense.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Was the general to whom the gentleman refers the general at the airport or a general here in Washington?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. It was the general at the airport.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He would have to clear with the Defense Department before he could make a request like that. That is contrary to their rules. They have to clear at the top here, at least with the chief of the Air Force.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The general did not make the request, the Congressman called the general there asking for an ex-

pression of his opinion as to whether or not these 25 units could be used.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The point is before he can get any more houses he has to clear that with somebody higher up. You cannot go directly to Congress and say you want more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think my friend the gentleman from California, in all good faith, misunderstands the situation. This good general has not asked for 25 housing units. He has told the fine gentleman, who is making a fine fight—and I hope the chamber of commerce remembers you next fall—he has simply told this fine gentleman, and this fine gentleman is simply telling us what he told him. So I do not think the general should get in any trouble in any way for what he did or what he said.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Anybody could justify the need for 25 more units, but that is not the way to get results, in my opinion, by the military bringing the matter to the attention of a Congressman and asking him to offer an amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. He did not ask him to do that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Of course, there are many places where housing is needed. This is an example. But they are not needed as much there as at other places. All we are trying to do is to furnish the most critically needed housing.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. In answer to the gentleman, I would say that it is just a matter of whether we want to take the word of the commanding general of the Forbes Airbase, where we have spent \$45 million in airplane facilities.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. This subcommittee is going to be engaged in the interim period looking into the various units that are needed, and I think the subject that the gentleman has brought up would be one that would call for an on-the-spot investigation. I am sure it is the intention of the subcommittee to look into a situation such as the gentleman has called to our attention to see if housing is needed and bring the facts before the Congress next year.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. In answer to that, I would say the same argument would apply to every authorization that you have offered here today.

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that under ordinary circumstances, I would support his amendment. However, when this bill was considered in committee, many committee members would have liked to have put in amendments for projects in their own States or districts. Had that been permitted and those projects put in, then

the number of housing units as provided in the bill presented to us by the Department of Defense as being necessary for the services, would have had to be reduced because there is an overall limitation of \$175 million in the bill. If we were to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, then the housing units will have to suffer at other bases and installations where the testimony shows they are needed more today than they are at the base in Kansas.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. What the gentleman says about many members of the committee is correct. As a matter of fact, when the bill came over from the Department it contained units in my own district, all of which were eliminated by the subcommittee. That is true of many Members of the House, and it is not possible to start putting each of those back or we will be back where we were before the subcommittee did its job in reducing the units to be built.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And we would not have any bill at all.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think this is a comparatively mild one. It is for only 25 units.

I know the committee has made every effort it could to keep this legislation in line with the requests. I know, too, this committee is more familiar with the entire problem than I am.

The reason I feel these units are necessary is because of the statement of the commanding officer of the base. Incidentally this is one of the large bases in the country and is just barely outside the district I represent.

The thing that gives importance to this proposal is because this is a strategic base. The commanding officer, who should know, says the units are required for the reason a few key officers must reside immediately in the area for the reason they may be called on a few moments notice.

The gentleman from California criticized the Member for quoting the commanding officer. The Member called the commandant and asked for the facts. The officer gave the facts as he knew them. I see nothing wrong with that.

I think credence should be given the request of the Real Estate Board of Topeka, who said in substance they had examined the situation and, in the opinion of the board, the request should be approved. If the request were many units, the situation would be different. I really think, for a big strategic airbase, the request is modest. I want it understood I am not in favor of going out and overloading airbases with Government-built homes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to a distinguished member of this committee and a former most distinguished member of the Armed Forces. I know he wants to be fair. He is really a great man.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I hope to be fair about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My only interest in this matter is that I believe this amendment to be right.

Mr. DEVEREUX. First of all, I want to point out that there are no projects in the district of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. I appreciate that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. There was an inference that perhaps that influenced my judgment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; I am sure of that. I apologize if there seemed to be such inference.

Mr. DEVEREUX. If the gentleman will read the bill thoroughly, he will find that in many cases we have allowed as low as five units.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And I think the one ahead of this one is for 433 units.

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is correct. But, for instance, at the fighter bases we have more. We have the fighter interceptors and so on.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is a strategic base, is it not?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe that is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And it is a bigger base, I believe, than the one named just ahead of it on the list, where more than 400 units are authorized. I know the judgment of the gentleman from Maryland is good. I would not dispute it, but it seems on the face of things, the amendment is reasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Kansas), there were—ayes 45, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: On page 15, line 11, after the period, insert "Provided, That not less than 60 percent of all units provided herein shall be constructed for family units for enlisted family quarters."

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in complete good faith and in light of what I have observed myself at some of these bases and particularly in light of the debate which has taken place here on this bill and the fact that there are no specific provisions in this legislation for enlisted men's quarters.

There has been no question that there is no specification in this bill as to how many units for enlisted men will be built or whether there will be one. Personally, I am not at all against building these officer units; in many cases they are highly necessary. But on the other hand I do get considerably irked at the attitude of the services as to the needs of the

family enlisted man's requirements and what they should have.

We heard the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and others complain about the lack of enlistments because the enlisted men were short of quarters. I do not care what the so-called justifications are that come here and are given before the committee. I know what is going to happen if this bill passes as it is and if appropriations are handled in the same general language: The great bulk of this is going for officers' quarters. I recall rather distinctly when we had a pay bill here one time involving the question of consideration for enlisted personnel and particularly married enlisted personnel and their dependents, and that the enlisted men got the business. I think that was unfortunate.

No wonder these men leave the service; I do not blame them a bit. I just want to be sure that when we pass this legislation we write into it language which will guarantee that the enlisted personnel shall receive not less than 60 percent and I hope it is as much as 75 percent. I think we better have it written into the bill and not just take somebody else's word for it that may not mean anything when it comes to the actual building under any administration of this law. That is why I urge the adoption of this amendment to meet the present situation. Then we shall know that the enlisted personnel will get consideration and there will be no question about it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. What is wrong with the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Not a thing.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not think so either.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I hope the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not think there is anything wrong with the gentleman's amendment either. Seventy percent appears in the justifications. We will be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. There is nothing spelled out in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I just want to say that I approve the gentleman's amendment. It makes certain that the bill does what the committee intends. I congratulate him.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MORANO, Chairman of the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 662, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there anyone who is absolutely opposed to the bill? If not, the Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 9924, to the Committee on Armed Services for further study.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had—

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the message announcing the agreement of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill S. 3137, entitled "An act to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8152. An act to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the com-

mittee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2846) entitled "An act to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940."

CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES IN THE ARID AND SEMI-ARID AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the message announcing the agreement of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill, S. 3137, entitled "An act to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate will be granted.

There was no objection.

MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN MERCHANT-TYPE VESSELS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3546) to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of such merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet as are necessary for national defense.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I will not object to the present bill, but, in order that I might address an inquiry to the majority leader. I wish to ask the majority leader if and when H. R. 7840, an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act, is to be called before the House for consideration? I have had innumerable inquiries made by Members from both sides of the aisle who are greatly interested in this piece of legislation. It laid awaiting action before the Committee on Rules for approximately 1 month. I was unable to penetrate the iron curtain that surrounds the proceedings of the Rules Committee to ascertain why it was not acted upon.

I was pleased that a week ago consideration was given to this measure. Favorable action was taken within a few minutes of the application being heard. From that time until the present the bill has slumbered—I would not say peacefully, but it has slumbered with indecision as to when it would be brought before the House. I have tried and Members of this House have tried to ascertain when it would come before the House. There has been no definite word

given as yet except that it might be brought up tomorrow or it might be brought up next Monday, I assume, in case we do not adjourn sine die. For that reason, I would like to know, in order that I may answer questions, as to when this bill will be brought up. There is much that I could say that I will not say. I am asking the question in the interest of procedure in this House. I want it to be known that if I do not get a definite answer, then there is left to me only one course to pursue, and that will be to object to every unanimous-consent request that is made for the transaction of business with the exception of those consents that are asked for the introduction of personal remarks in the RECORD; that is, until I get a definite answer as to when this bill will be brought up.

Now, this is not based upon impatience. I would have the membership of the House know that there is no one in this House that has shown greater patience with respect to this matter than I, but there comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue. And, I assure you it is not a pleasant situation for me to be placed in, to take this position before the House, and I only do it in the way in which I am doing it in order that the House may know, in the event that it is necessary for objections to be made as I have indicated, the reason for it.

This piece of legislation, in my opinion, would pass this House practically unanimously if it was given an opportunity, and I am determined, if the power lies within one individual or more to stop it from coming up, then I am hopeful that maybe a course of action, such as I have indicated, by one Member of the House can bring it to a vote in this House for the benefit of those who are anxious to vote upon this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection unless someone wishes to answer my question.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It might have been a little better if the gentleman had discussed the matter with me.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have done so several times.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say this to the gentleman?

Mr. WOLVERTON. How many times do I have to discuss it? I do not want to say everything at this time that I could say.

Mr. HALLECK. Neither do I.

Mr. WOLVERTON. But I have said what I meant, anyway. Are you willing to give us any time when this will be brought up, when we will be recognized?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. I have in my hand a list of measures on which rules have been granted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is right—

Mr. HALLECK. A rule was granted on your bill to which you refer on July 22.

Calendar No. 2037

83D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 9924

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 30 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

AN ACT

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I

4 SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized
5 further to develop military installations and facilities by
6 providing family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the construction or instal-
8 lation of public works, which include site preparation,
9 appurtenances, utilities, equipment and the acquisition
10 of land, as follows:

1 CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

2 (Third Army Area)

3 Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Three hundred and twenty-
4 five units of family housing, \$4,906,000.

5 (Fourth Army Area)

6 Fort Bliss, Texas: Two hundred and seventy-two units
7 of family housing, \$3,845,000.

8 Fort Hood, Texas: Six hundred and thirty-nine units
9 of family housing, \$9,548,000.

10 (Fifth Army Area)

11 Camp Carson, Colorado: One thousand four hundred and
12 forty-seven units of family housing, \$21,508,000.

13 Camp Crowder, Missouri: Seventy-four units of family
14 housing, \$1,106,000.

15 (Sixth Army Area)

16 Fort Lewis, Washington: One thousand one hundred
17 and ten units of family housing, \$16,450,000.

18 Camp Cooke (United States Disciplinary Barracks),
19 California: Fifty units of family housing, \$737,000.

20 Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Twenty units of family
21 housing, \$297,000.

22 (Quartermaster Corps)

23 Belle Mead General Depot, New Jersey: Ten units of
24 family housing, \$176,000.

1 (Signal Corps)

2 Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Two hundred and eight units
3 of family housing, \$3,102,000.

4 Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Virginia:
5 Ten units of family housing, \$168,000.

6 (Corps of Engineers)

7 Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Three hundred and six units of
8 family housing, \$4,460,000.

9 (Transportation Corps)

10 Fort Eustis, Virginia: Two hundred and seventy-one
11 units of family housing, \$4,065,000: *Provided*, That before
12 any of the units at this installation are constructed the Sec-
13 retary of Defense shall determine the extent to which the
14 public housing designated as project VA44061 (Ferguson
15 Park) will satisfy the housing requirement herein provided
16 for, and this authorization shall be reduced accordingly.

17 Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, North Carolina:
18 Four units of family housing, \$77,000.

19 (Army Security Agency)

20 Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Ten units of fam-
21 ily housing, \$178,000.

22 (Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

23 Sandia Base, New Mexico: Three units of family hous-
24 ing, \$88,000.

1 Killeen Base, Texas: Five units of family housing,
2 \$110,000.

3 (Tactical Sites)

4 Various locations: Three hundred units of family hous-
5 ing, \$4,433,000.

6 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized fur-
7 ther to develop military installations and facilities by pro-
8 viding family housing for personnel of the military depart-
9 ments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public
10 works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment,
11 in a total amount of \$13,254,000.

12 TITLE II

13 SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized fur-
14 ther develop naval installations and facilities by providing
15 family housing for personnel of the military departments and
16 their dependents by the construction or installation of public
17 works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utili-
18 ties, equipment and the acquisition of land as follows:

19 CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

20 (First Naval District)

21 Naval hospital, Newport, Rhode Island: Ten units of
22 family housing, \$152,000.

23 (Third Naval District)

24 Naval hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Ten units of
25 family housing, \$151,900.

1 (Fourth Naval District)

2 Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Twenty-
3 five units of family housing, \$321,300.

4 Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ten units of
5 family housing, \$152,000.

6 (Fifth Naval District)

7 Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Fifty
8 units of family housing, \$642,500.

9 Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina:
10 Thirty-five units of family housing, \$473,300.

11 Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Ten units of
12 family housing, \$152,000.

13 Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Virginia (Skiffes Creek
14 Annex) : Five units of family housing, \$91,200.

15 (Sixth Naval District)

16 Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Ninety-five units
17 of family housing, \$1,272,900.

18 Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Thirty units of
19 family housing, \$397,300.

20 Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Twenty units of
21 family housing \$273,900.

22 Naval station, Key West, Florida: Eighty-three units of
23 family housing, \$1,085,400.

24 Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City,
25 Florida: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$343,100.

1 Naval hospital, Pensacola, Florida: Twenty-five units of
2 family housing, \$321,300.

3 Naval supply corps school, Athens, Georgia: Thirty
4 units of family housing, \$456,000.

5 Naval auxiliary air station, Glynco, Georgia: Eighty-
6 three units of family housing, \$1,115,900.

7 Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Missis-
8 sippi: Seven units of family housing, \$102,100.

9 Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South Caro-
10 lina: One hundred and eighty-five units of family housing,
11 \$2,546,900.

12 Naval hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina: Fifty units
13 of family housing, \$654,300.

14 (Eighth Naval District)

15 Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Eighty
16 units of family housing, \$1,096,900.

17 (Eleventh Naval District)

18 Naval amphibious base, Coronado, California: Two units
19 of family housing, \$47,300.

20 Naval air station, Miramar, California: Fifteen units
21 of family housing, \$204,500.

22 Naval hospital, San Diego, California: Ten units of
23 family housing, \$152,000.

1 (Twelfth Naval District)

2 Naval hospital, Oakland, California: Ten units of family
3 housing, \$152,000.

4 Naval supply center, Oakland, California: Ten units of
5 family housing, \$152,000.

6 Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, California:
7 Fifty units of family housing, \$666,000.

8 Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Sixty units
9 of family housing, \$787,500.

10 (Potomac River Naval Command)

11 Naval hospital, Bethesda, Maryland: Thirty units of fam-
12 ily housing, \$409,000.

13 Naval district area: Four units of family housing,
14 \$108,000.

15 MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

16 Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Georgia: One
17 hundred and nineteen units of family housing, \$1,595,700.

18 Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, California: One
19 unit of family housing, \$27,000.

20 Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California:
21 Twelve units of family housing, \$173,400.

22 Marine Corps school, Quantico, Virginia: Three hundred
23 and thirty-two units of family housing, \$4,730,300.

1 OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

2 (Atlantic Ocean Area)

3 Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Forty-five
4 units of family housing, \$595,100.

5 Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: One hundred units
6 of family housing, \$1,379,000.

7 Naval air activities, Port Lyautey, French Morocco:
8 One hundred and seventy-five units of family housing,
9 \$2,366,300.

10 (Pacific Ocean Area)

11 Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: One hun-
12 dred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$2,312,600.

13 Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Ha-
14 waii: Two units of family housing, \$30,400.

15 SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized fur-
16 ther to develop naval installations and facilities by providing
17 family housing for personnel of the military departments and
18 their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which
19 include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total
20 amount of \$1,218,300.

21 TITLE III

22 SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized
23 further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by pro-

viding family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Strategic Air Command)

Sedalia Air Force Base, Missouri: Four hundred and eighteen units of family housing, \$6,042,450.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma: Three hundred and seventy units of family housing, \$5,340,950.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebraska: Four hundred and forty-three units of family housing, \$6,397,300.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kansas: Two hundred and ninety-three units of family housing, \$4,230,850.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine: Three hundred and five units of family housing, \$4,401,850.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana: Two hundred and fifty-three units of family housing, \$3,651,650.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

1 Great Falls Air Force Base, Montana: Four units of
2 family housing, \$87,750.

3 Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia: Five units of family
4 housing, \$108,000.

5 Larson Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of
6 family housing, \$108,000.

7 Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: Four units of family
8 housing, \$87,750.

9 Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: Four units of family
10 housing, \$87,750.

11 Mather Air Force Base, California: Four units of family
12 housing, \$87,750.

13 Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: Four units of
14 family housing, \$81,000.

15 Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: Five units of family
16 housing, \$108,000.

17 Travis Air Force Base, California: Six units of family
18 housing, \$128,250.

19 (Air Defense Command)

20 Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York: One hun-
21 dred and eleven units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

22 Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts: Two hundred and
23 thirty units of family housing, \$3,324,850.

24 Newcastle County Airport, Delaware: One hundred
25 and eight units of family housing, \$1,559,200.

1 Truax Air Force Base, Wisconsin: One hundred and
2 eleven units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

3 Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan: Ninety-four units
4 of family housing, \$1,355,100.

5 Paine Air Force Base, Washington: Seventy-four units
6 of family housing, \$1,069,200.

7 Oxnard Air Force Base, California: Seventy-four units
8 of family housing, \$1,069,200.

9 Ent Air Force Base, Colorado: One hundred units of
10 family housing, \$1,444,300.

11 Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: Fifty-seven units
12 of family housing, \$824,200.

13 Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pennsylvania: Fifty-seven
14 units of family housing, \$824,200.

15 Niagara Municipal Airport, New York: Fifty-seven
16 units of family housing, \$824,200.

17 Minneapolis-Saint Paul Airport, Minnesota: Seventy-
18 four units of family housing, \$1,069,200.

19 Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota: One hundred and
20 eleven units of family housing, \$1,602,450.

21 Geiger Field, Washington: Fifty-seven units of family
22 housing, \$824,200.

23 Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: Fifty-seven units
24 of family housing, \$824,200.

1 Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: Fifty-three units of
2 family housing, \$763,050.

3 McGee-Tyson Airport, Tennessee: Fifty-seven units of
4 family housing, \$824,200.

5 Portland International Airport, Oregon: Sixty-three
6 units of family housing, \$906,000.

7 Minot area, North Dakota: Seventy-one units of family
8 housing, \$1,028,300.

9 Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan: Fifty-one units
10 of family housing, \$735,000.

11 (Tactical Air Command)

12 Clovis Air Force Base, New Mexico: One hundred and
13 eighty-five units of family housing, \$2,671,650.

14 Hurlburt Air Force Base, Florida: Two hundred and
15 ninety-five units of family housing, \$4,258,900.

16 Foster Air Force Base, Texas: Two hundred and twenty-
17 two units of family housing, \$3,202,550.

18 McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey: Five units of
19 family housing, \$108,000.

20 Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina: Five units of
21 family housing, \$108,000.

22 (Air Training Command)

23 Luke Air Force Base, Arizona: One hundred and thirty-
24 three units of family housing, \$1,921,450.

1 Laredo Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and twelve
2 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

3 Gary Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and twelve
4 units of family housing, \$1,615,300.

5 Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and
6 sixty-six units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

7 Greenville Air Force Base, Mississippi: One hundred and
8 twenty-nine units of family housing, \$1,860,300.

9 Moody Air Force Base, Georgia: One hundred and forty-
10 eight units of family housing, \$2,138,400.

11 Stead Air Force Base, Nevada: Ninety-two units of
12 family housing, \$1,329,400.

13 McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas: One hundred and
14 sixty-six units of family housing, \$2,398,600.

15 Webb Air Force Base, Texas: Ninety-two units of
16 family housing, \$1,329,400.

17 Parks Air Force Base, California: Ninety-two units of
18 family housing, \$1,329,400.

19 (Military Air Transport Service)

20 Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina: Five hun-
21 dred and four units of family housing, \$7,285,000.

22 (Continental Air Command)

23 Beale Air Force Base, California: Two hundred and
24 thirty-six units of family housing, \$3,406,650.

1 (Research and Development Command)

2 Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico: Five units of
3 family housing, \$108,000.

4 SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized
5 further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by pro-
6 viding family housing for personnel of the military depart-
7 ments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public
8 works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment,
9 in a total amount of \$4,250,000.

10 TITLE IV

11 SEC. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air
12 Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further
13 development of military, naval, and Air Force installations
14 and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act
15 without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and
16 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and
17 prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by
18 section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The
19 authority to provide family housing by the construction or
20 installation of public works shall include authority to acquire
21 lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including
22 the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange
23 of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

24 SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated

1 not to exceed \$175,000,000 to carry out the purposes of titles
2 I, II, and III of this Act.

3 SEC. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in
4 titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the
5 Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 per centum,
6 but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount
7 authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

8 SEC. 404. Not to exceed two hundred and fifty of the
9 units of family quarters constructed under the authority of
10 titles I, II, and III of this Act shall have a net floor area of
11 not to exceed two thousand and one hundred square feet.
12 None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed
13 by this Act shall have a net floor area in excess of one thou-
14 sand two hundred and fifty square feet, and the average net
15 floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed
16 one thousand and eighty square feet: *Provided*, That not less
17 than 60 per centum of all units provided herein shall be con-
18 structed for family units for enlisted family quarters.

19 SEC. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose
20 of this Act shall be available for expenses incident to con-
21 struction or rehabilitation work authorized by this Act, in-
22 cluding administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

23 SEC. 406. Whenever—

24 (a) the President determines that compliance with

1 the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second
2 Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this
3 Act with respect to the establishment or development of
4 military installations and facilities in foreign countries
5 would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions
6 of this Act; and

7 (b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller
8 General have agreed upon alternative methods for con-
9 ducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President
10 is authorized to exempt such contracts from the require-
11 ments of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress.

Passed the House of Representatives July 29, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

AN ACT

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

JULY 30 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

28. MINERALS; PUBLIC LANDS. Passed as reported S. 3071, to amend the act authorizing agricultural entries under the non-mineral-land laws of certain mineral lands (pp. 13349-50).
29. FARM LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 7568, to authorize conveyance of certain land by the Farm Loan Board of Hawaii (pp. 13351-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
30. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE. Passed as reported S. 17, providing for a commission to formulate and transmit to the Attorney General, for report to Congress, general rules of practice and procedure for Federal agencies, to become effective unless disapproved by both Houses. The bill also provides that the rules proposed by the commission shall not deal with qualifications or requirements for admission to practice before such agencies..(pp. 13327-8.)
31. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Passed with amendment H. R. 9924, substituting therefor the language of S. 3818, as amended, to provide for family housing for military personnel and their dependents and authorize the Secretary of Defense to procure such housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies obtained through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. The bill also provides that Department of Defense appropriations would be made available for reimbursement to CCC in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used. (pp. 13344-7.)
32. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1955 did not reach final agreement thereon and will meet again Mon., Aug. 6 (p. D974), and the Senate agreed to consider on Fri., Aug. 13 the conference report on the atomic energy bill, with a 3-hour debate limitation (p. 13473).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

33. TAXATION. Reps. Seely-Brown and Bow inserted an explanation of certain provisions of the new revenue revision law (pp. A5941-3, A5960-1).
34. PUBLIC DEBT. Rep. Marshall inserted a Washington Daily News article, "The Administration Is Indebted To A Gimmick," stating that Government figures which appear to show the public debt as being less are the result of a 'bookkeeping gimmick' (pp. A5943-4).
35. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Rep. Bow inserted a report to his constituents outlining various measures in which he has given support to the administration (pp. A5944-6).
- Rep. Priest inserted a transcript of a radio discussion between Reps. McCormack and Allen, "The Leading Question: What Are The Accomplishments of the 83rd Congress?" (pp. A5949-52).
36. GOVERNMENT COMPETITION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Harden stating that "Uncle Sam is not supposed to be a businessman" and inserting a Christian Science Monitor article presenting views on Government with respect to free enterprise (pp. A5946-8).

37. SMALL BUSINESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Wilson commending the Small Business Administration for the advice and assistance given to small business firms (pp. A5952-4).
38. SURPLUS FOOD. Sen. Lehman inserted a press release and a series of letters urging the Commissioner of Social Welfare of N. Y. to apply for participation in the Federal surplus food program (p. A5955).
39. FORESTRY. Sen. Thyne inserted Leonard Carpenter's (American Forest Products Industries) recent address outlining the accomplishments of "tree farmers" in Minn. and what can be done in many other States (pp. A5955-7).
40. POSTAL RATES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hagen opposing proposals to increase postal rates (pp. A5967-8).
41. DROUGHT RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Rep. Mack urging immediate drought aid for southern Ill. and inserting telegrams to the Governor asking that he request the President to proclaim this area as a major-disaster area (pp. A5983-4).

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

42. CREDIT UNIONS. S. 3683, to transfer administration of D. C. credit unions from Treasury to HEW. Approved August 10, 1954 (Public Law 576, 83rd Cong.).
43. WATER COMPACT. S. 3699, approving an interstate compact entered into by Louisiana and Texas and relating to the Sabine River. Approved August 10, 1954 (Public Law 578, 83rd Cong.).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY GPO

44. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 6310, to exempt from CAB regulation transportation of agricultural products. H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
45. HEALTH. H. R. 2341, to protect the public health from the dangers of fluorination of water. H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR AUG. 12: Farm program bill, conferees (exec).

oOo

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this is the House version of the fringe benefit bill. A similar bill passed the Senate some weeks ago, and was sent to the House of Representatives, where it was amended by including the classified pay bill. It has not moved since that time.

It is a piece of legislation which is important to the Federal workers of the Nation. It has the approval of everyone with whom I have talked.

The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service took the fringe benefit bill and the Federal insurance bill and combined them as amendments to the House bill which is presently before the Senate.

Since that time the House has passed the Federal insurance bill. I ask unanimous consent that the provisions with regard to Federal insurance may be stricken from the bill now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. That would leave the fringe benefit bill about as it passed the Senate for further action, either by the committee of conference, or by the House accepting the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The supplemental appropriation bill, which the Senate considered a few days ago, provided for salary increases for certain employees of the Senate. Would the proposed action involve a duplication of the previous action?

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee talked with me about that, and I told him I would check and propose an amendment to take care of that situation. Under a gentleman's agreement on the Senate floor, the number of positions to be included in the bill were 150. If the appropriation bill should supersede this bill, providing for 150, I sincerely hope that they will be included in that number. It is my sincere intention that that be done, but I have not prepared the language for such an amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I happen to know that the House conferees seriously objected to the amendment placed in the bill changing the civil-service ratings of certain employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and said that the matter could be cured, in their opinion, by some contact which was to be made with the Civil Service Commission. I understand that contact has been made. If that be true, then there will be nothing in the bill, when it comes out of conference, of the nature to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Arizona, because that is certainly what I hoped would be the attitude of the Senate on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas kindly advise what portion of the bill relative to the insurance features he asks to have stricken out?

Mr. CARLSON. The section I wish stricken is an amendment to H. R. 2263, beginning on page 28.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. I ask that that be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it title 6?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 20, it is proposed to strike out title 6, Group Insurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, after line 14, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 703. The Official Reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of the provisions of section 2 (a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer this amendment to the bill because I sincerely hope the Senate will take care of the Official Reporters of Debates, who have worked so faithfully during this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1980) to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point, Va., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SPECIAL REGULATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CONVENTION

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 560) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1954, to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1954 Convention Corporation on the occasion of such convention, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

QUARTERING OF TROOPS DURING AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 561) to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in activities related to the American Legion National Convention of 1954 was considered, ordered to a read reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RELATING TO ATTACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8128) to amend section 1089 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia relating to attachment proceedings, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "after", to strike out "'1809'" and insert "'1089'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONSOLIDATION OF POLICE AND MUNICIPAL COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8915) to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 3, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "121" and insert "1121."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the municipal court for the

District of Columbia, to create "the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia", and for other purposes."

WAIVER OF ANNUITIES, RELIEF, OR RETIREMENT COMPENSATION OF RETIRED POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7853) to permit retired policemen, firemen, and teachers of the District of Columbia to waive all or part of their annuities, relief, or retirement compensation, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That any person entitled to relief or retirement compensation pursuant to the provisions of section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended (title 4, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), may decline to accept all or any part of such relief or retirement compensation by a waiver signed and filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the relief or retirement compensation waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. CASE. The purpose of the bill is to permit retired policemen and firemen to waive all or any part of their retirement compensation or relief to which they are entitled, in the same manner as persons retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Section 3 of Public Law 555 of the 82d Congress, approved July 16, 1952, gives such privilege to the latter group of employees.

The purpose of the committee amendment is to eliminate school teachers from the provisions of this measure. This was done in accordance with the request of a representative of the American Federation of Teachers appearing at the subcommittee hearings on June 22, 1954.

Representatives of the policemen's and firemen's groups favored the bill, as did the District of Columbia Commissioners.

The House passed the bill, and it was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to permit retired policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia to waive all or part of their relief or retirement compensation."

CONDEMNATION OF INSANITARY BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6127) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board

for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROVISION FOR FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3818) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 16, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to procure family housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of not to exceed the equivalent of \$75 million in foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Congress), which family housing shall be in addition to family housing to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense through the use of appropriated funds. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the military department concerned is authorized to utilize and transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation in lieu of reimbursement pursuant to section 105 of said act the allowances for quarters that would otherwise be payable to military personnel occupying such family housing to the amount of the cost of the quarters involved.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, to the value of \$75 million through the use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Congress).

The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a quarterly report, the first of which shall be submitted 3 months subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the 3-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.

Appropriations of the Department of Defense otherwise available for payment of quarters allowances of personnel occupying such family housing shall be available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to section 105 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop military installations and facilities by providing family

housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land, as follows:

Continental United States

(Third Army Area)

Fort Campbell, Ky.: 300 units of family housing, \$4,093,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: 250 units of family housing, \$3,213,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: 600 units of family housing, \$8,099,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Camp Carson, Colo.: 1,000 units of family housing, \$13,427,000.

Camp Crowder, Mo.: 70 units of family housing, \$952,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Wash.: 800 units of family housing, \$10,686,000.

Camp Cooke (United States Disciplinary Barracks), Calif.: 50 units of family housing, \$663,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: 20 units of family housing, \$267,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Beile Mead General Depot, N. J.: 10 units of family housing, \$158,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: 30 units of family housing, \$486,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: 200 units of family housing, \$2,899,000.

Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Va.: 10 units of family housing \$164,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Va.: 300 units of family housing, \$3,984,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Va.: 250 units of family housing, \$3,374,000.

Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, N. C.: 4 units of family housing, \$69,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Two Rock Ranch Station, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$160,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons project)

Sandia Base, N. Mex.: 3 units of family housing, \$79,000.

Killeen Base, Tex.: 5 units of family housing: \$99,000.

(Tactical Sites)

Various locations: 300 units of family housing, \$3,990,000.

Sec. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop military installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military department and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$12,230,550: *Provided*, That in his discretion the Secretary of the Army may utilize the authorization contained in this section to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and acquisition of land, at locations to be determined by him. Such family housing shall be in addition to, but shall not exceed 5 percent of, the total number of units authorized by section 101 of this act, but the average cost of such additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family

housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

Continental United States

(1st Naval District)

Naval hospital, Newport, R. I.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

(3d Naval District)

Naval hospital, St. Albans, N. Y.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

(4th Naval District)

Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.: 25 units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

(5th Naval District)

Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: 50 units of family housing, \$642,500.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, N. C.: 35 units of family housing, \$473,300.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Va.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va. (Skiffes Creek Annex): 5 units of family housing, \$91,200.

(6th Naval District)

Naval air station, Cecil Field: 90 units of family housing, \$1,192,200.

Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Fla.: 30 units of family housing, \$397,300.

Naval air station, Key West, Fla.: 20 units of family housing, \$273,900.

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: 80 units of family housing, \$1,044,500.

Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Fla.: 25 units of family housing, \$343,100.

Naval hospital, Pensacola, Fla.: 25 units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval supply corps school, Athens, Ga.: 30 units of family housing, \$456,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Glynnco, Ga.: 80 units of family housing, \$1,058,600.

Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Miss.: 7 units of family housing, \$102,100.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.: 175 units of family housing, \$2,305,600.

Naval hospital, Beaufort, S. C.: 50 units of family housing, \$654,300.

(8th Naval District)

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.: 80 units of family housing, \$1,073,400.

(11th Naval District)

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif.: 2 units of family housing, \$47,300.

Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.: 15 units of family housing, \$204,500.

Naval hospital, San Diego, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

(12th Naval District)

Naval hospital, Oakland, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.: 10 units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, Calif.: 50 units of family housing, \$666,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.: 60 units of family housing, \$787,500.

Marine Corps facilities

Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Ga.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,339,800.

Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, Calif.: 1 unit of family housing, \$27,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.: 12 units of family housing, \$173,400.

Marine Corps school, Quantico, Va.: 300 units of family housing, \$4,121,700.

Outside continental United States

(Atlantic Ocean Area)

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: 45 units of family housing, \$595,100.

Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: 100 units of family housing, \$1,379,000.

(Pacific Ocean Area)

Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: 175 units of family housing, \$2,289,100.

Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, T. H.: 2 units of family housing, \$30,400.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$1,218,300: *Provided*, That in his discretion the Secretary of the Navy may utilize the authorization contained in this section to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and acquisition of land, at locations to be determined by him. Such family housing shall be in addition to, but shall not exceed 5 percent of, the total number of units authorized by section 201 of this act, but the average cost of such additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

Continental United States

(Strategic Air Command)

Sedalia Air Force Base, Mo.: 400 units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Okla.: 360 units of family housing, \$4,827,600.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.: 400 units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kans.: 280 units of family housing, \$3,754,800.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine: 300 units of family housing, \$4,023,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, La.: 200 units of family housing, \$2,682,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Ariz.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Wash.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Great Falls Air Force Base, Mont.: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Hunter Air Force Base, Ga.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Miss.: 30 units of family housing, \$402,300.

Larson Air Force Base, Wash.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Mather Air Force Base, Calif.: 4 units of family housing, \$87,750.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: 4 units of family housing, \$81,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nev.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Calif.: 6 units of family housing, \$128,250.

(Air Defense Command)

Suffolk County Air Force Base, N. Y.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Mass.: 200 units of family housing, \$2,682,000.

Newcastle County Airport, Del.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Truax Air Force Base, Wis.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Mich.: 90 units of family housing, \$1,206,900.

Paine Air Force Base, Wash.: 70 units of family housing, \$938,700.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Calif.: 70 units of family housing, \$938,700.

Ent Air Force Base, Colo.: 90 units of family housing, \$1,206,900.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pa.: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

Niagara Municipal Airport, N. Y.: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport, Minn.: 70 units of family housing, \$938,700.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Minn.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Geiger Field, Wash.: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

McGee-Tyson Airport, Tenn.: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

Portland International Airport, Oreg.: 60 units of family housing, \$804,600.

Minot area, North Dakota: 65 units of family housing, \$871,650.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich.: 50 units of family housing, \$670,500.

(Tactical Air Command)

Clovis Air Force Base, N. Mex.: 170 units of family housing, \$2,279,700.

Hurlburt Air Force Base, Fla.: 275 units of family housing, \$3,687,750.

Foster Air Force Base, Tex.: 200 units of family housing, \$2,682,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, S. C.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

(Air Training Command)

Luke Air Force Base, Ariz.: 125 units of family housing, \$1,676,250.

Laredo Air Force Base, Tex.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Gary Air Force Base, Tex.: 100 units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Tex.: 150 units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

Greenville Air Force Base, Miss.: 120 units of family housing, \$1,609,200.

Moody Air Force Base, Ga.: 140 units of family housing, \$1,877,400.

Stead Air Force Base, Nev.: 90 units of family housing, \$1,206,900.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.: 150 units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

Webb Air Force Base, Tex.: 85 units of family housing, \$1,139,850.

Parks Air Force Base, Calif.: 85 units of family housing, \$1,139,850.

(Military Air Transport Service)

Charleston Air Force Base, S. C.: 450 units of family housing, \$6,034,500.

(Continental Air Command)

Beale Air Force Base, Calif.: 225 units of family housing, \$3,017,250.

(Research and Development Command)

Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex.: 5 units of family housing, \$108,000.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further development of military, naval, and Air Force installations and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this act without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The authority to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works shall include authority to acquire lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$175 million to carry out the purposes of titles I, II, and III,

and not to exceed \$15 million to carry out the purposes of section 408, of this act.

Sec. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 percent, but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this act.

Sec. 404. Not to exceed 250 of the units of family quarters constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of this act shall have a net floor area of not to exceed 2,100 square feet. None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed by this act shall have a net floor area in excess of 1,250 square feet, and the average net floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed 1,080 square feet.

Sec. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction or rehabilitation work authorized by this act, including administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

Sec. 406. Whenever—

(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this act; and

(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, 82d Congress.

Sec. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, to the value of \$75 million through the use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.).

The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a quarterly report, the first of which shall be submitted 3 months subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the 3-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.

Appropriations of the Department of Defense otherwise available for payment of quarters allowances of personnel occupying such family housing shall be available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to section 105 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used.

Sec. 408. The Secretaries of the military departments are authorized to acquire a total of not to exceed 5,000 units of trailers which may be made available at locations both inside and outside continental United States for occupancy by military personnel and their dependents on a rental basis without loss of any allowances for quarters.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that there is on the calendar a companion

bill, namely, Calendar No. 2037 (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the Military Departments of the Department of Defense and for other purposes. The bill seems to be somewhat different in character.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if consent is given that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the House bill, I desire to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Senate bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if I may address a question to the Senator from South Dakota, does the bill provide for family quarters on all military bases in this country, or merely on military bases adjacent to Washington?

Mr. CASE. No; the bases are scattered throughout the United States, and there are some overseas bases, but they are mostly in Continental United States. The Senator from South Dakota has in his hands a list of the authorizations by States. They appear alphabetically, and under the first ones listed there appear several in Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Are the quarters to be provided for military personnel, or civilian personnel?

Mr. CASE. They are primarily to be used by military personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have one more question. What percentage of the quarters would be for military personnel and what percentage would be for civilian personnel?

Mr. CASE. It is possible that in some isolated locations or stations, there might be some housing occupied by civilian personnel, but primarily I should say that more than 90 percent of the housing would be occupied by dependents of military personnel.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the provision in conjunction with the Wherry housing program or in addition to it?

Mr. CASE. In a way it is in addition to it, but the Senator from South Dakota may say that in the supplemental appropriation bill which was passed by the Senate a few days ago a provision was added, which would in effect constitute a rider, that the funds appropriated under this heading—and that would be under the authorization of the bill—would not be used for family housing unless the Secretary of Defense should certify that it was impracticable to construct family housing under provisions of title 8 of the Housing Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That answers my question. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the Military Departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause of the

House bill (H. R. 9924) be stricken out, and that the text of the Senate bill as amended be substituted.

The reason for that request is that the Senate committee spent several days in hearings in an endeavor to reduce the authorizations for particular stations, in order that the total authorizations would come within the amounts proposed to be authorized. The total number of individual allocations under the House bill would have exceeded the authorizations.

The Senate committee also inserted two or three major new sections in the bill. For instance, one authorizes the use of foreign currencies for construction overseas, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The committee feels that those are definitely constructive changes in the bill, and desires that the provisions of the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill, but passed under the House number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that all after the enacting clause be stricken out and the Senate bill as amended be inserted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3818 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement on the provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

The principal purpose of S. 3818 is to authorize the Secretaries of the 3 military departments to construct 11,967 units of family quarters for military personnel. Secondary purposes are to authorize the Secretary of Defense to procure family housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies generated by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and to authorize the acquisition of 5,000 house trailers for availability to military personnel on a rental basis without loss of quarters allowances.

For those military personnel who have dependents, the Government furnishes either public quarters or quarters allowances at rates prescribed by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended. The rates currently in effect are \$77.10 monthly for enlisted men with two dependents and \$96.90 per month for enlisted men with 3 or more dependents. The monthly rates of quarters allowances for officers at the present time are as follows: Second lieutenants and ensigns, \$85.50; first lieutenants or lieutenants (junior grade), \$94.20; captain or full lieutenant, \$102.60; major or lieutenant commander, \$119.70; lieutenant colonel or commander, \$136.80; colonel or captain, \$136.80; flag or general officers, \$171. The housing that would be constructed under the authorization contained in this bill will mean that quarters allowances at these rates will not be paid to the personnel occupying the housing.

The Government-owned quarters now in existence have been constructed with ap-

propriated funds, but although several billions of dollars have been authorized and appropriated for military construction since the end of World War II, an insignificant portion of this construction has been for family quarters. This statement is substantiated by the fact that only 807 units of family housing have been built with appropriated funds within the United States over the past 4 years.

The failure to provide adequate family housing for military personnel has undoubtedly been one of the contributing causes of a reduction in reenlistment rates and an increase in the resignations of officers, with consequential loss of trained personnel and expense of training replacements. The committee does not contend that the nonavailability of family housing is the only factor that influences a person to leave the military service; we cannot disregard the incentives that military personnel have to leave military service. The Congress has approved a program of substantial benefits and privileges available under the so-called bill of rights for persons entering civilian life after military service. These benefits include, among other things, mustering-out pay, lump-sum payment for accrued leave, unemployment compensation, Government assistance in financing the purchase of homes, Government assistance for education. Almost all the top-ranking civilian and military officials in the Department of Defense have stressed the serious consequences flowing from loss of trained personnel through failure to reenlist and resignation of officers. Again let me state that the committee does not maintain that this family housing authorization is a complete answer to the loss of military personnel but it does believe that in conjunction with other programs, the construction of family housing should tend to make military service more attractive.

The Senator from South Dakota might also mention that the Congress has had no hesitation in authorizing and appropriating the many billions necessary to provide materiel such as airplanes, ships, tanks, and guns, and the bases from which to operate these implements of war. Since the cost of providing adequate living quarters for the personnel who must man this equipment is relatively small when compared with the cost of the equipment and the bases themselves, there is no sound reason why we should be niggardly in this respect.

The committee has been convinced that the military departments have used conservative criteria in estimating requirements for family quarters. Illustrative of this conviction is the fact that in the calculating of these requirements the permanent peacetime strength of the Armed Forces has been assumed to be 1,750,000, which figure is slightly more than one-half of the present actual strength. About 10 percent of the 1,750,000 are officers and some 90 percent enlisted men. Approximately 80 percent of the officers and 20 percent of the enlisted men are estimated to be married and to require family quarters for the purpose of this calculation, which results in the requirement of 140,000 units for officers and 315,000 units for enlisted men, a total of 455,000 units. Against this total there are now available 47,000 permanent public quarters and 25,000 temporary public quarters that are in satisfactory condition and 87,000 units constructed under the so-called Wherry Act that are completed or in the process of completion. The total availability of 149,000 units when matched against the total requirement of 455,000 units reflects a deficit of 306,000 units. It has been estimated that 150,000 privately owned housing units are available in local communities. Thus the net deficit is at least 150,000 units.

With a deficit of this size, the obvious question is how best to meet the deficit.

The principal alternatives are to construct the housing through appropriated funds or to cause the housing to be constructed through further utilization of title VIII of the National Housing Act, which is known as the Wherry Housing Act. When the committee questioned Department of Defense representatives regarding why the Wherry Act could not be utilized to provide the needed housing these representatives furnished a statement that has been set forth on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report. The Senator from South Dakota recommends that this statement be read by those who would urge Wherry housing as a complete solution to this problem.

It should be noted that every housing unit constructed pursuant to the authorization contained in S. 3818 will mean that the Appropriations Committee will not be required to appropriate quarters allowances for the personnel occupying these units. Since the average quarters allowance is between \$1,000 and \$1,100 per year, and this authorization bill would provide 11,967 units of family housing, it will be seen that in future years appropriations for quarters allowances can be reduced by about \$12 million each year. After 14 or 15 years the cost of the housing will have been amortized and the only cost to the Government after that time will be for maintenance. The estimated life of the housing is 35 years so that after the total cost of the construction has been returned to the Government substantial savings will accrue over approximately 20 years, and these savings would be in addition to those caused by whatever effect an increase in reenlistment rates and a decrease in resignations might have.

The type and cost of housing provided under this authorization will be subject to promulgation of detailed specifications by the Secretary of Defense. One-, two-, three-, and four-bedroom houses will be provided. Housing constructed for enlisted men will average 952 square feet in area and \$12,850 in cost; housing for company-grade officers will average 1,126 square feet in area and \$15,200 in cost; housing for field-grade officers will average 1,500 square feet in area and \$20,250 in cost; and housing for officers in flag and general rank will average 2,000 square feet in area and \$27,000 in cost.

Since the average cost of all housing to be constructed under the authorization contained in this bill will be \$13,500, it is manifest that the great preponderance of the housing to be constructed is for enlisted men and company-grade officers.

When the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1955, which has become Public Law 534, 83d Congress, was pending before the House Committee on Armed Services, the Department of Defense requested an amendment to the bill that would have added \$350 million in authorization for the construction of military family housing. The House Committee on Armed Services decided to consider the family-housing authorization separately, and Public Law 534, 83d Congress, does not contain authorization for family housing. Subsequently, the House Committee on Armed Services conducted hearings on the housing authorization and reported H. R. 9924. The line items comprising H. R. 9924, as it was reported by the House Armed Services Committee, total some \$216 million, but an appropriation of not to exceed \$175 million was recommended to carry out the purposes of the bill.

The committee was of the opinion that the appropriations authorization should correspond to the total of the line items in the bill. After conducting hearings, the committee made reductions and deletions necessary to cause the line items to not exceed \$175 million.

Section 407 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to procure family housing for military personnel in foreign coun-

tries through the use of foreign currencies, in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.). The extent of this authority is limited to the equivalent of \$75 million in foreign currencies.

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 authorizes the President to negotiate agreements with friendly nations for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities in exchange for foreign currencies. Section 104 of the act prescribes the purposes for which the President may use the foreign currencies that accrue to the United States from the sale of surplus commodities. Section 105 of the act provides that "any department or agency of the Government using any of such currencies for a purpose for which funds have been appropriated shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used."

In order that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be unfairly charged with the cost of military housing, section 407 of this bill provides that appropriations otherwise available for payment of quarters allowances of personnel occupying family housing acquired pursuant to this authority shall be available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used.

The committee has amended section 407 by adding a provision that the Committees on Armed Services shall be furnished quarterly reports of the housing procured pursuant to the authority contained in this section.

Section 408 of the bill authorizes the Secretaries of the military departments to acquire a total of not to exceed 5,000 units of trailers to be made available for occupancy by military personnel and their dependents on a rental basis without loss of any allowances for quarters.

The committee has been sufficiently impressed by recent refinements in trailers to believe that they would serve a useful purpose in some locations where it is inadvisable to construct or otherwise to procure housing for military personnel. Trailers probably do not constitute housing that is sufficiently adequate to require the personnel occupying them to forfeit the entire amount of quarters allowances, and it is contemplated that the rentals charged for the use of these trailers will be somewhat less than the quarters allowances accruing to the personnel occupying them. The rentals received will be covered into the Treasury under "Miscellaneous receipts."

If there are questions from Senators I shall be glad to attempt to answer them. If there are no questions I recommend that the bill be passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN MINERAL RIGHTS TO MRS. PEARL O. MARR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3251) to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Mrs. Pearl O. Marr, of Crossroads, N. Mex., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 2. Mrs. Pearl O. Marr shall succeed to the position of the United States as lessor at the time the Secretary of the Interior makes conveyance under this act. The United States shall not be liable for any rents or royalties accruing before the date of the conveyance.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed and without compensation to Mrs. Pearl O. Marr, of Crossroads, N. Mex., all oil, gas, or other mineral rights which are held by the United States in the following-described lands situated in Lea County, N. Mex.: The east half of the southeast quarter of section 33; the south half of the south half of section 34; the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 35, township 9, range 37 east, New Mexico principal meridian, containing two hundred and eighty acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. Mrs. Pearl O. Marr shall succeed to the position of the United States as lessor at the time the Secretary of the Interior makes conveyance under this act. The United States shall not be liable for any rents or royalties accruing before the date of the conveyance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTINGUISHMENT OF OUTCROP AND UNDERGROUND FIRES IN COAL FORMATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 270) to provide for the control and extinguished of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 3, line 14, after "Sec. 5", to insert "(a)"; in line 21, at the beginning of the line, to strike out "(a)" and insert "(1)"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(2)"; after line 3, to insert:

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall require in connection with any project for the control or extinguishment of fires in any inactive coal mine on any lands not owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, except where such project is necessary for the protection of lands or other property owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, (1) that the State or person owning or controlling such lands contribute on a matching basis 50 percent of the cost of planning and executing such project, or (2), if such State or person furnishes evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior of an inability to make the matching contribution herein provided for, that such State or person pay to the Government, within such period of time as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine, an amount equal to 50 percent of the cost of planning and executing such project. At least 75 percent of the funds expended in any fiscal year, from any appropriation available to carry out the purposes of this act, in connection with projects for the control or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal mines where such action is not necessary for the protection of lands or other property owned or controlled by the United States or any of its agencies, shall be expended in conformity with clause (1) of this subsection.

On page 5, line 7, after the word "act", to insert "of 1949", and on page 6, line 10, after the word "fund", to strike out "for disbursement by the Secretary of the Interior as the terms of the grant may require," and insert "to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Treasury upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the terms of the grant."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT BONDS BY THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 6886) to ratify and confirm sections 5 and 6 of Act 254 and Act 280 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1953 and to authorize the issuance of certain public improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BY THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 5997) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds, the proceeds thereof to be used for veterans' mortgages, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

The bill (H. R. 8634) to amend section 22 of the Organic Act of Guam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES PROPERTY TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The bill (S. 2486) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to convey to the State of Wyoming, for the use of the Wyoming National Guard, about 7,680 acres of grazing land in Platte County, Wyo., to be used as a maneuver and target area.

I might say the bill provides that if the land is not used for that purpose the title shall revert to the United States.

The fact of the matter is that the National Guard of several surrounding States have indicated that they desire to use this area for the same purpose. The State of Wyoming has set aside several thousand acres of its own land for the same purpose. In addition to that, the State has bought up about \$40,000 worth of privately owned lands.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the transfer of Federal lands lying within the proposed maneuver area to the State of Wyoming.

Mr. MORSE. I asked for the explanation because I knew it would bear out what the Senator from Wyoming has just said. The bill is in line with a whole series of conveyances for National Guard purposes, such as at Fort Blanding, in Florida; at Klamath Falls, in Oregon; and one in California, as I recall.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The bill is definitely in line with the Morse formula, insofar as the conveyance is concerned, because the Federal Government is to receive more than adequate consideration, when we consider the Federal benefits which accrue from the National Guard service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2486), which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 6, after the word "Lots" to strike out "1, 2, 3, and 4, southwest quarter northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 1; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, south half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 2; lots 3 and 4, west half southeast quarter section 3; lots"; in line 13, after "section 7", to strike out "northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 10; north half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter section 11; east half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter section 12; northwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter section 13."

On page 3, line 23, after "section 33" to strike out "east half" and insert "northeast quarter"; on page 5, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 2. (a) Where lands described to be conveyed herein are being used under valid outstanding United States grazing leases, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey the lands only after he finds suitable provision, equitable to such lessees, has been made to compensate them for losses resulting from the use of the lands for the purposes of this act and to assure them appropriate preference to such future use of the lands for grazing as may be consistent with the purposes of this act.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, at the earliest possible date after the execution of the conveyance authorized by this act, shall issue a permit to the State of Wyoming allowing the State the free use of the lands described below for the purposes described in section 1 of this act and subject to adequate protection of the lands for Federal purposes:

authorizing the transfer of personnel and appropriations to defense activities of various departments and agencies pursuant to law, regarding rental of Government-owned living quarters. Contains language, similar to that in previous years, prohibiting the use of funds of corporations for purchase of construction of office buildings, and authorizing the use of appropriated funds to purchase foreign credits owed to or owned by the U. S.

3. PERSONNEL. Received the conference report on H. R. 2263, the so-called fringe-benefits bill (H. Rept. 2665)(pp. 13893-901). The text of the bill, as agreed to by the conferees, is printed in the Record.
4. ATOMIC ENERGY. Redeived the revised conference report on H. R. 9757, to make various changes in the Atomic Energy Act (H. Rept. 2666)(pp. 13873-88). The revised bill is printed in the Record.
5. VEHICLES; FURNITURE. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 8753, to authorize GSA to establish and operate motor vehicle pools and systems and to provide office furniture and furnishings when agencies are moved to new locations, to direct GSA to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and to authorize CSC to regulate operators of Government-owned motor vehicles (p. 13824). This bill will now be sent to the President.
6. DEBT LIMIT. By a division vote of 193 to 31, concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 6672, inoreasing the debt limit of the Government. The amendment provides for a temporary increase of \$6 billion until June 30, 1955. (pp. 13824-8). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 10009, to provide for the review of customs tariff schedules, to improve procedures for the tariff classification of unenumerated articles, and to repeal or amend obsolete provisions of the customs laws (pp. 13822-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
8. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 9924, to provide for family housing for military personnel and their dependents, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to procure such housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies obtained through sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and to make Defense Department appropriations available to reimburse CCC in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used (p. 13829). Senate conferees have not yet been appointed.
9. SOCIAL SECURITY; FARM LABOR. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 9366, the social security bill, which includes a provision extending social security retirement coverage to approximately 2.6 million additional farm workers (p. 13820). Senate conferees have been appointed.
10. FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 10051 (p. 13821). Senate conferees have been appointed.
11. EDUCATION. Passed without amendment S. 3629, to amend Public Law 874, 81st Cong. so as to postpone the effective date of the 3 percent "absorption" requirement of school districts in areas affected by Federal activities for 1 additional year (through June 30, 1955). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Passed with amendment S. 3268, to amend Public Law 815, 81st Cong., so as to extend for 3 additional years the program of Federal assistance for school construction under title III thereof (p. 13857).

12. PERSONNEL; RETIREMENT. Passed with amendment S. 3627, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to tighten up several "loopholes" (pp. 13828-9).
13. FARM LABOR. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 2862, to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special nonquota immigration visas available to certain skilled alien sheepherders (H. Rept. 2662) (p. 13902).
14. INVESTIGATIONS; PERSONNEL. Passed with amendments S. 2308, to give the Attorney General concurrent jurisdiction over investigation of violations of title 18 of the U. S. Code (regarding crimes) by Government officers and employees, except for members of the armed forces and the Post Office Department (pp. 13859-60).
15. CONVENING OF CONGRESS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 585, to provide that the 84th Congress shall convene at noon on Wed., Jan. 5, 1955 (p. 13858).

SENATE

16. FARM LOANS. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 3245, to authorize the Secretary to use \$15,000,000 of the Disaster Loan Revolving Fund for emergency loans to farmers and stockmen until June 30, 1955 (p. 13942). This bill will now be sent to the President.
17. RECLAMATION. Discussed and passed over, upon the objection of Sen. Smathers, H. R. 5301, to authorize the Interior Department to make loans to privately owned reclamation projects (pp. 13926-7).
Discussed and passed over, upon the objection of Sen. Smathers, H. R. 9981, to provide for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies (p. 13928).
Sen. Watkins stated "there is an extreme need for facts to clarify much of the confusion which has resulted from misinformation spread about the upper Colo. River project" and inserted George D. Clyde's (commissioner of interstate streams for Utah) article which discussed the issues (pp. 13909-10).
18. ATOMIC ENERGY. Agreed, 59 to 17, to the revised conference report on H. R. 9757, the atomic energy bill (pp. 13982-5).
19. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment H. R. 5718, to limit to 6 years the period for collection by the Government of compensation received by officers and employees in violation of the dual compensation laws (p. 13928). This bill will now be sent to the President.
20. TAXATION. Sen. Ferguson inserted the President's statement made upon the signing of H. R. 8300, the general tax revision bill (pp. 13937-42).
21. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Watkins inserted a newspaper editorial and stated that the "role that can be played by the Federal Government in cooperating in watershed improvement program under the Hope-Aiken measure is adequately shown" in this editorial (pp. 13910-1).

ity rights based on a separation which (a) terminated service meeting this requirement, or (b) occurred prior to this amendment, shall be restored upon separation from subsequent service which fails to meet said requirement.

"No credit shall be allowed for any service subsequent to the date of the separation on which title to annuity is based. Any amounts deducted from salary for retirement purposes during such service shall upon separation be refunded to such officer or employee without interest, and shall be subject to redeposit as provided in section 12 (b) (2) of this act. Any such amount not so refunded to the officer or employee before his death shall be paid in the order of precedence prescribed in section 12 (e)."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 2, after the period in line 5, insert the following: "Any officer or employee who shall have given notice of his desire to come within the purview of this act pursuant to the last paragraph of section 3 (a) of this act shall be deemed for the purposes of this requirement to have been subject to the provisions of this act during any period of service or part thereof ending not later than September 30, 1954, with respect to which there shall have been deposited the amounts specified in section 9."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERFORMANCE OF MAIL-MESSENGER SERVICE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 2263) to authorize the Postmaster General to readjust the compensation of holders of contracts for the performance of mail-messenger service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9910) to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "appointed", insert "from the classified civil service or the Foreign Service reserve or Foreign Service staff."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have a brief explanation of this bill?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9910, to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, would provide for lateral entry into the Foreign Service from the Foreign Service reserve or

Foreign Service staff or from the civil service by persons who had had 4 years of service in the Government if they were under 31 or 4 years if over 31. The Senate put in the words "from the classified civil service or the Foreign Service reserve or Foreign Service staff."

The word "classified" would bar certain persons who are under civil service in the Department of State known as the ABC classes and also incumbent indefinite civil-service employees. Not all of these are dual-service employees who might be eligible for transfer to the Foreign Service. While the State Department would prefer the bill as it passed the House, I am informed that those who are seeking this legislation are willing to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is the bill that provides the first step toward increasing the Foreign Service officer corps from about 1,300 as it now exists, to 3,900?

Mr. VORYS. It is a bill to increase the Foreign Service by bringing in new blood through lateral entry. There are a number of other administrative and statutory provisions recommended which would result in a very substantial increase in the Foreign Service, but this bill alone would not do it. The numbers under this bill are limited to 500, and it is in effect only until March 31, next.

Mr. GROSS. I simply want the Members of the House to know what is here being done. This is the first step toward practically tripling the number of Foreign Service officers, that is, those who would serve in the Foreign Service officer corps in the State Department. I am opposed to the bill, and I want to be on record as opposed to it for the reason that this Government ought to be cutting down on employees in the Foreign Service in the interests of economy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FAMILY QUARTERS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of California, CUNNINGHAM, DEVEREUX, Brooks of Louisiana, and MILLER of California.

ROTC UNITS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speak-

er's desk the bill (H. R. 7734) to amend section 47 of the National Defense Act concerning the requirement for bond covering certain property issued by the United States for use by Reserve Officers' Training Corps units maintained at educational institutions, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 9, strike out "appropriate" and insert "adequate, but in no event less than \$5,000."

Line 12, after "instruction.", insert "A bond without surety thereon may be accepted by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, provided the institution to which the property is issued furnishes to the Secretary concerned satisfactory evidence of its financial responsibility."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

ACCEPTANCE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 7734

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 7734 is to amend the National Defense Act concerning the requirement for bond covering Federal property issued by the Government for use by ROTC units maintained at educational institutions.

Under present law the Secretary must require a bond to be furnished in the amount of the total value of the property issued. This is requiring educational institutions to furnish large bonds—which result in large premiums—far in excess of what is necessary to cover probable losses.

The House bill merely provides that the Secretary may require a bond in such amount as he considers appropriate. The Senate amended the bill so as to require the bond to be in an amount not less than \$5,000. The Senate further amended the bill so as to provide that an institution could furnish a bond without surety if satisfactory evidence is presented to the Secretary concerned of its financial responsibility.

AUTHORIZING COMMANDER, AIR UNIVERSITY, TO CONFER APPROPRIATE DEGREES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3712) to authorize the commander, Air University, to confer appropriate degrees upon persons who meet all requirements for those degrees in the resident college of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide that under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force the commander of the Air University may confer appropriate degrees upon persons who meet all the requirements for those degrees in the resident college of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology. The commander may confer the degrees, however, only after the Institute of Technology has received accreditation by a nationally recognized accreditation association or authority.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The United States Air Force Institute of Technology, which is a part of the Air University, is located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. The Institute offers a variety of courses in the engineering field with special emphasis on aeronautical engineering. Its curriculum is specifically geared to afford its students maximum use of one of the world's finest aviation laboratories, the Wright Air Development Center. The Institute has been in operation for some years, being the modern outgrowth of the Air Service Engineering School which began in 1919, which, at that time, was one of the world's first schools devoted to instruction in aeronautical engineering.

Persons who receive training at the Institute are selected Air Force officers who are trained in the field of aeronautical engineering and related areas.

DESIRABILITY OF THE LEGISLATION

At the present time there is no legal authority for the commander of the Air University to confer degrees on the students who successfully complete the courses at the resident college. In civilian institutions of higher learning authority to grant degrees must be authorized by State law. In federally operated schools Congress must provide the authority. This bill will permit the students who successfully complete the prescribed course of instruction to receive the appropriate degree, after the Institute has received the appropriate accreditation.

ACCREDITATION NECESSARY BEFORE GRANTING OF DEGREES

It should be emphasized that this bill in itself does not authorize the conferring of degrees by the United States Air Force Institute of Technology. It authorizes such authority only after this institution has been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting association or authority.

An institution cannot be recognized for accreditation unless it has degree-granting authority. This bill will provide the means by which the Institute may be eligible for accreditation. The committee assumes that the accrediting authority will make certain that the Institute fully meets the academic standards, which make an institution eligible to confer an appropriate degree.

LEGISLATIVE PRECEDENT FOR THE BILL

It may be noted that Federal authority to confer degrees is in effect for the United States Military, Naval, Coast

Guard, and Merchant Marine Academies. The Air Force Academy will possess such authority as a result of Public Law 325, 83d Congress.

The Navy counterpart to the United States Air Force Institute of Technology, the United States Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, Calif., was authorized the degree-granting authority as a result of Public Law 303, 80th Congress.

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with pardonable pride that I call to the attention of my colleagues here in the House that the United States Air Force Institute of Technology is located in the Third District of Ohio, which I have the great honor to represent here in the Congress of the United States.

This Institute was founded many years ago, in 1919, I believe, when it was then known as the Air Service Training School, and I am certain that it was one of the first schools in the world which specialized in teaching aeronautical engineering. The name of the Air Service Training School was changed some years ago to the United States Air Force Institute of Technology and is a part of the Air University. Its curriculum was broadened, additional members of the faculty were selected with great care, and the Institute continues to operate at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base adjacent to Dayton, Ohio. Students in the Institute are carefully selected Air Force officers whose increased ability and training will be of additional and important service to our United States Air Force.

Technical and scientific improvements which are constantly being made in aircraft point up the need for the specialized training given by the Air Force Institute of Technology and which is not available elsewhere. It is of great importance for the defense of our Nation that the officers and men of our Air Force be the best informed and trained men of any air force in the entire world. We have pointed with great pride to the accomplishments of our Air Force in the past and the quality of our personnel. This legislation gives proper recognition to the need for continued improvement.

It is a well-known principle and practice that before any educational institution can confer degrees indicating the proficiency of its students and for these degrees to be properly recognized, the educational institution must have been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting association or authority. However before such accrediting association can grant such recognition the school must first be properly authorized to do so under whatever State or Federal authority under which it was established. Since the Air Force Institute of Technology is authorized by Congress to operate it is right and proper that we here today consider S. 3712 and I sincerely hope it is approved by the House.

It is assumed, Mr. Speaker, that the national accrediting association under whose rules and regulations authority will be granted, under this legislation, to the Air Force Institute of Technology to confer various degrees will make certain

proper requirements as to faculty, curriculum, facilities, equipment, and other proper matters.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the United States Military, Naval, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine Academies already have the authority to confer degrees. The Air Force Academy recently established by Congress will also have such authority under Public Law 325, 83d Congress. I am also informed, Mr. Speaker, the similar Navy school, the United States Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, Calif., was granted the authority to confer proper degrees as the result of Public Law 303 of the 80th Congress.

S. 3712, which we are considering here at this time, Mr. Speaker, will grant this similar and very necessary authority to the United States Air Force Institute of Technology to confer proper degrees. It is understood, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of the Air Force will prescribe the necessary rules and regulations.

This will be very helpful legislation, Mr. Speaker, and is a right and proper privilege to be extended to the Air Force Institute of Technology. It is my sincere hope that it will receive unanimous approval.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Commander, Air University, may, upon accreditation of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology by a nationally recognized accreditation association or authority, confer appropriate degrees upon persons who meet all requirements for those degrees in the Resident College of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO CONVEY CERTAIN PROPERTY IN EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3595) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in El Paso, Tex., and described as part of Fort Bliss, to the State of Texas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Texas all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to a parcel of land within Fort Bliss Military Reservation, such parcel consisting of a portion of North El Paso Addition and a portion of Morningside Heights Addition, El Paso, Tex., and being more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

Beginning at a point which is the intersection of the east right-of-way line of Pol-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE (For Department Staff Only) Issued August 18, 1954
 Formations of August 17, 1954
 83rd-2nd, No. 160

CONTENTS

Agricultural attaches.....2	Flood control.....11	Reclamation.....6
Appropriations.....2,7	Foreign aid.....4,9,12	Records.....2
Atomic energy.....3	Foreign trade.....24,29	Reports.....10
Budget.....2,10	Forestry.....28	Research.....10
Buildings.....2	Holidays.....27	Soil conservation.....28,28
CCC.....14	Hoover Commission.....2	Solicitor.....2
Census.....2	Investigations.....16	Stockpiling.....30
Claims.....10	Labor, farm.....25	Surplus commodities.....4,12
Commodity exchange.....2	Legislative program.....19	Surplus property.....5
Comptroller General.....18	Loans, farm.....28,32	Taxation.....22
Convening of Congress.....17	Mangoes.....14	TVA.....31
Drought relief.....23	Marketing.....21	Under Secretary of State.....15
Education.....2	Nomination.....15,31	Water conservation.....28
Expenditures.....2,10	Personnel.....2,13,16,18,27,33	Water facilities.....2,32
Farm program.....1,20	Price supports.....20,26	
FCA.....10		

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on farm program bill. House agreed to conference report on supplemental appropriation bill and acted on amendments in disagreement. House agreed to conference report on atomic energy bill. Senate passed omnibus flood control bill. Senate passed bill to extend unemployment compensation to Federal employees. Senate agreed to conference report on fringe-benefits personnel bill. Senate made bill increasing CCC borrowing authority its unfinished business. Rep. Hill inserted statement of assistance available under drought-relief program. Rep. Moulder criticized administration of drought relief.

HOUSE

1. **FARM PROGRAM.** Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9680, the farm program bill, by a division vote of 208 to 47 (pp. 14027-40, 14043). The Senate agreed to this conference report by a yea-nay vote of 44 to 28 (pp. 14152-69). This bill will now be sent to the President.

2. **SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955.** Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 9936, and acted upon amendments which had been reported from conference committee in disagreement.

Concurred in the following Senate amendments: Census of business, manufactures, and mineral industries, \$8,430,000; and unemployment compensation for Federal employees, \$10,000,000.

Concurred in the following Senate amendments with amendments: FAS, for agricultural attaches in foreign countries, \$1,400,000, to be transferred from the State Department (the Senate amendment would have provided \$1,500,000, of which \$1,000,000 would have been transferred from the State Department), Commodity Exchange Authority, \$93,000 (the House amendment brings up to date a citation to a bill), Water Facilities Act, \$5,000,000 (House amendment changes a reference from "appropriation" to "authorization"), Office of the Solicitor, USDA, \$45,000 (instead of \$54,000 as provided by the Senate amendment), Office

of Vocational Rehabilitation, \$4,000,000 (Senate amendment provided \$6,000,000). Surveys of Government records, records management, and disposal practices, \$300,000 (Senate amendment provided \$500,000). Provision to credit receipts, for temporary subleasing of excess space to commercial organizations, to the fund from which rental payments are made (House amendment limits this provision to the fiscal year 1955).

The House also concurred in the Senate amendment to make available the unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated for acquisition of sites and preparation of drawings and specifications for Federal building projects outside D. C.

For other items of interest to the Department see Digest 159.

During debate on this bill:

Rep. Cannon criticized deficiencies and spoke in favor of economy.

Rep. Patman criticized the Hoover Commission as an abdication of congressional responsibility.

Regarding the agricultural-attaches provision, Rep. Andersen said: "I wish to make the record clear that the conferees have agreed that services from counterpart funds or other sources heretofore made available to this service while under State Department supervision shall continue to be available to this service on the same basis as heretofore." (pp. 14009-26.)

3. ATOMIC ENERGY. Agreed to the new conference report on H. R. 9757, to revise the Atomic Energy Act (pp. 14043-8). This bill will now be sent to the President.
4. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Received the conference report on H. R. 9924, to provide for family housing for military personnel and their dependents, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to procure such housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies obtained through sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and to make Defense Department appropriations available to reimburse CCC in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used (p. 14069).
5. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed without amendment H. R. 10187, to provide for payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property (p. 14050).
6. RECLAMATION. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 8498, to authorize the Pa Verde project, Calif. (p. 14052). Senate conferees have not been appointed.
7. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. O'Hara, Ill., inserted a summary of appropriation laws of the 83rd Congress, 1st session (pp. 14059-69).
8. SOIL CONSERVATION. Received from the Interior Department a report that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of lands served by the Eden project, Wyo. (pp. 14072-3).
9. FOREIGN AID. Received from FOA a report on administration of the Yugoslav assistance program (H. Doc. 493) (p. 14072).
10. REPORTS. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 6290, to discontinue certain reports required by law, including: Regional research laboratories, claims over \$1,000 compromised under Farm Tenant Act, status of Farm Tenant Mortgage Insurance Fund, contract research under RIA, accounting for funds received and expended, agricultural marketing revolving fund (FCA), and inactive and permanent appropriations and/or funds. One amendment concurred in was to continue reports under the Tort Claims Act. (p. 14050.) This bill will now be sent to the President.

SENATE

11. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed, 77 to 2, with amendments H. R. 9859, the omnibus flood control bill, which authorizes \$20,000,000 additional to this Department for work on watersheds. Senate conferees were appointed. (pp. 14118-37.)
12. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9924 (see item 4 above) (pp. 14076, 14138-9).
13. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 2263, the fringe-benefits personnel bill (p. 14138).
Passed with amendments H. R. 9709, to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, which includes a provision extending it to approximately 2.5 million Federal employees (pp. 14114-7).
Passed with amendment H. R. 9909, to prohibit payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses (pp. 14148-52). Agreed to a Williams amendment extending from 3 to 5 years the statute of limitations on certain crimes (pp. 14149-52).
Sen. Knowland submitted amendments he intends to propose to H. R. 7774, to establish a uniform system of granting incentive awards to Federal employees (p. 14076).
14. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. The amendment by Sen. Holland (see Digest 157) to H. R. 9756, to increase the borrowing power of CCC from \$8.5 billion to \$10 billion, would include mangoes in the provision which would prohibit imports of certain commodities that do not comply with USDA marketing orders. The amendment also would make this provision effective upon the enactment of H. R. 9756 or the Agricultural Act of 1954, whichever occurs later.
15. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Herbert Hoover, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State (p. 14170).
16. INVESTIGATIONS; PERSONNEL. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 2308, to give the Attorney General concurrent jurisdiction over investigation of violations of title 18 of the U. S. Code (regarding crimes) by Government officers and employees, except for members of the armed forces and the Post Office Department (p. 14139). This bill will now be sent to the President.
17. CONVENING OF CONGRESS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 585, to provide that the 84th Congress shall convene at noon on Wed., Jan. 5, 1955 (p. 14097). This measure will now be sent to the President.
18. COMPTROLLER GENERAL. Passed without amendment S. 3868, to authorize the payment of salary to any individual given recess appointment as Comptroller General of the U. S. before the beginning of the 84th Cong. (pp. 14080-1).
19. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. H. R. 9756, increasing the borrowing power of CCC from \$8.5 billion to \$10 billion, was made the unfinished business (p. 14152). The "Daily Digest" states that there will be a call of the calendar and consideration of various conference reports during Wed. (p. D996).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

20. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Hunter inserted his summary of the accomplishments of this Congress and the administration in the field of agriculture and related

matters (pp. A6081-6).

Sen. Beall inserted a Baltimore Sun editorial, "An Investment Pays Off," commending the President for the progress of his legislative program and stating that his program, "designed to bring more resiliency into the whole structure of farm supports, was argued before the true farmers of the country as if he and Secretary Benson had never heard of the political farmers" (p. A6098).

Sen. Thye inserted a St. Paul Pioneer Press article, "Benson Strategy," discussing passage of the farm bill and stating that "the result is being widely hailed as a personal triumph for Secretary Benson" (p. A6099).

21. **MARKETING.** Rep. Church inserted a Federal Reserve Bank (Chicago) agricultural letter discussing rising marketing costs and the share of the farmers and the middlemen (pp. A6087-8).

Rep. Hill inserted his recent address before the Annual Convention of the Independent Grocers Alliance discussing the problems of marketing, food distribution, and "the battle against waste of fruit and vegetables" (pp. A6092-3).

22. **TAXATION.** Extension of remarks of Reps. Knox and Berry giving some of the highlights of the new tax law (pp. A6088-90, A6129-30).

23. **DROUGHT RELIEF.** Extension of remarks of Rep. Moulder criticizing the administration of the drought relief program and inserting a Daily Democrat-Leader (Fayette, Mo.) article stating that "we say it is a rotten deal and not worth the price of the airplane tickets Washington spent to send men out here to decide which class of farmer they would try to help" (p. A6101).

Rep. Hill inserted a statement explaining assistance available under the drought-relief program (pp. A6118-9).

24. **FOREIGN TRADE.** Rep. Bailey inserted O. R. Strackbein's (chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import Policy) statement discussing to what "extent imports may be injurious, a matter of indifference or even helpful" (pp. A6106-8).

25. **FARM LABOR.** Rep. Rooney inserted a Nat'l Catholic Weekly Review America commenting on the Mexican "wetback" problem (p. A6109).

26. **PRICE SUPPORTS.** Sen. Thye inserted a Washington Post and Times Herald editorial and his letter in response to the editorial which he said "clearly and unmistakably" impugn the motives of those Members of the Senate who opposed changing the level of farm price supports (pp. A6119-20).

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. **PERSONNEL; HOLIDAYS.** S. Con. Res. 105, by Sen. Johnston (introduced Aug. 13), to excuse Government employees from work on the afternoon of Aug. 31, 1954, to attend the parade of The American Legion in D. C.; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
28. **FARM LOANS.** S. 3877, by Sen. Gillette, to accelerate establishment of comprehensive soil- and water-conserving works on private and public property through provision of appropriate credit for conservation, reforestation, and water-control work; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 14075). Remarks of author (pp. 14075-6).

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

AUGUST 17, 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSON of California, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9924]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On pages 16 and 17 of the Senate engrossed amendment strike out section 407 and insert the following:

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, to the value of \$25,000,000 through the use of foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress).

The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a dollar amount equivalent to the value of the foreign currencies used during any fiscal year pursuant to the authority contained in this section. For the purpose of such reimbursement, the Department of Defense may utilize appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel.

The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a quarterly report, the first of which shall be submitted three months subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in

this section during the three-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.

And the Senate agree to the same.

LEROY JOHNSON,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
J. P. S. DEVEREUX,
OVERTON BROOKS,
GEORGE P. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANCIS CASE,
JAMES H. DUFF,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
By W. H. D.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On July 29, 1954, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 9924, which was a bill to provide family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents. On August 11, 1954, the Senate considered and passed the House bill in amended form by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting the language of the companion Senate bill.

While the Senate amended the House bill in numerous minor respects, resulting in a total reduction of some 1,600 family units and a reduction in the total authorization from \$216,000,000 to \$175,000,000, it was the considered viewpoint of the House Committee on Armed Services that the overall nature of these amendments were not sufficient to justify a conference. However, the Senate added a new section 407 to the bill, the purpose of which was to permit the Department of Defense to use foreign currencies, on a reimbursable basis, which were generated in foreign friendly nations through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Various members of the House Committee on Armed Services and Members of the House expressed concern as to whether or not the language contained in section 407 would jeopardize the credit of the Commodity Corporation, it being felt that some assurance should be given that agency that it would be reimbursed in full, and without undue delay, for any foreign currencies which it might make available to the Department of Defense for the construction of overseas family housing.

The Senate amendment would have authorized a total of \$75,000,000 for family housing units by the above-mentioned procedure. It was the view of the managers on the part of the House that such construction should be undertaken on a more modest basis, while the plan was being proved on its merits, and that appropriate assurances be given the Commodity Credit Corporation on the question of adequate and prompt reimbursement. As a consequence, the House, having disagreed to section 407, receded with the amendment set forth in the conference report, to which amendment the Senate agreed.

It is recognized by all that a serious housing condition confronts military personnel, both at home and abroad, and that the situation abroad is particularly bad. It is also recognized that the Government has on hand large surpluses of agricultural commodities which may be sold abroad and thereby generate large amounts of foreign currencies to be expended for certain specified purposes. The enactment of this

provision will authorize the Department of Defense to participate in the use of the currencies generated in the foreign friendly countries to the benefit of our military personnel and without impairment to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

LERROY JOHNSON,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
J. P. S. DEVEREUX,
OVERTON BROOKS,
GEORGE P. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.



Appropriations—Continued

General Services Administration: Emergency operating expenses-----	\$200, 000
Department of Commerce: Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses, defense production activities-----	4, 200, 000
Department of the Interior: Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses, defense production activities-----	500, 000
Federal Civil Defense Administration:	
Operations-----	8, 525, 000
Federal contributions-----	10, 500, 000
Emergency supplies and equipment-----	27, 500, 000
Total, Federal Civil Defense Administration-----	46, 525, 000
Total, chapter XI-----	55, 800, 000
CHAPTER XII. CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS	
Claims and judgments-----	12, 121, 334
Grand total-----	615, 989, 964
PUBLIC LAW 218—H. R. 6391, MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT	

A. Appropriates \$4,531,507,000 for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. Requires payments to any 1 engineering firm on any 1 project in excess of \$25,000 be reported to the Committees on Appropriations at least twice annually. Prohibits the use of funds appropriated hereunder for payments on any debt of any foreign government or on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; prescribes condition of payments to European Payments Union. Directs that at least 50 percent of domestic commodities procured hereunder be transported on domestic-flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Items:

Appropriations
MUTUAL SECURITY

Military assistance, Europe-----	\$1, 860, 000, 000
Military assistance, Near East and Africa-----	270, 000, 000
Military and other assistance, Asia and the Pacific-----	1, 035, 000, 000
Military assistance, American Republics-----	15, 000, 000
Mutual defense financing, Europe-----	220, 000, 000
Mutual defense financing, Formosa and Indochina-----	84, 000, 000
Mutual defense financing, manufacturing in France-----	85, 000, 000
Mutual defense financing, manufacturing in United Kingdom-----	85, 000, 000
Mutual defense financing, for equipment, etc., in Indochina-----	400, 000, 000
Mutual special weapons planning-----	50, 000, 000
Economic and technical assistance, Near East and Africa-----	33, 792, 500
Economic and technical assistance, defense support, Asia and the Pacific-----	51, 278, 001
Technical assistance, American Republics-----	22, 342, 000
Basic materials development-----	19, 000, 000
Special economic assistance, Near East and Africa-----	147, 000, 000
Special economic assistance, India and Pakistan-----	75, 000, 000
Movement of migrants-----	7, 500, 000
Multilateral technical cooperation-----	9, 500, 000

Appropriations—Continued

International children's welfare work-----	\$9, 814, 333
Ocean freight, voluntary relief shipments-----	1, 580, 166
Contributions to United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency-----	50, 700, 000
Total, Mutual Security-----	4, 531, 507, 000

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. JOHNSON of California, from the committee of conference, submitted the following conference report:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2669)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On pages 16 and 17 of the Senate engrossed amendment strike out section 407 and insert the following:

"SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, to the value of \$25,000,000 through the use of foreign currencies acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress).

"The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a dollar amount equivalent to the value of the foreign currencies used during any fiscal year pursuant to the authority contained in this section. For the purpose of such reimbursement, the Department of Defense may utilize appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel.

"The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a quarterly report, the first of which shall be submitted three months subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the three-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LEROY JOHNSON,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
J. P. S. DEVEREUX,
OVERTON BROOKS,
GEORGE P. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

FRANCIS CASE,
JAS. H. DUFF,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
By W. H. D.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On July 29, 1954, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 9924, which was a bill to provide family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents. On August 11, 1954, the Senate considered and passed the House bill in amended form by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting the language of the companion Senate bill.

While the Senate amended the House bill in numerous minor respects, resulting in a total reduction of some 1,600 family units and a reduction in the total authorization from \$216 million to \$175 million, it was the considered viewpoint of the House Committee on Armed Services that the overall nature of these amendments were not sufficient to justify a conference. However, the Senate added a new Section 407 to the bill, the purpose of which was to permit the Department of Defense to use foreign currencies, on a reimbursable basis, which were generated in foreign friendly nations through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Various members of the House Committee on Armed Services and Members of the House expressed concern as to whether or not the language contained in Section 407 would jeopardize the credit of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it being felt that some assurance should be given that agency that it would be reimbursed in full, and without undue delay, for any foreign currencies which it might make available to the Department of Defense for the construction of overseas family housing.

The Senate amendment would have authorized a total of \$75 million for family housing units by the above-mentioned procedure. It was the view of the managers on the part of the House that such construction should be undertaken on a more modest basis, while the plan was being proved on its merits, and that appropriate assurances be given the Commodity Credit Corporation on the question of adequate and prompt reimbursement. As a consequence, the House, having disagreed to section 407, receded with the amendment set forth in the conference report, to which amendment the Senate agreed.

It is recognized by all that a serious housing condition confronts military personnel, both at home and abroad, and that the situation abroad is particularly bad. It is also recognized that the Government has on hand large surpluses of agricultural commodities which may be sold abroad and thereby generate large amounts of foreign currencies to be expended for certain specified purposes. The enactment of this provision will authorize the Department of Defense to participate in the use of the currencies generated in the foreign friendly countries to the benefit of our military personnel and without impairment to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

LEROY JOHNSON,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
J. P. S. DEVEREUX,
OVERTON BROOKS,
GEORGE P. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KEAN on the subject of the social-security law, notwithstanding that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD.

Mr. COLE of New York and to include an article.

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. CEDERBERG) and to include a letter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in three instances.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RODINO) in three instances.

Mr. BAILEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEPPARD and to include a newspaper item.

Mr. EBERHARTER that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House sine die he be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on several subjects and insert extraneous matter and excerpts therefrom on various subjects.

Mr. ROONEY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNTER in two instances.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

Mr. BERRY and to include his letter covering the new tax bill.

Mr. MAHON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUDGE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and to include an address.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAH.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. O'BRIEN of New York).

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. FEIGHAN to extend his remarks following those of Mr. DIES on the motion to instruct the conferees on the Communist Control Act.

Mr. BATES and to include an editorial.

Mr. KNOX.

Mr. HILL to revise and extend the remarks he made on the agricultural bill today, and to extend his remarks and include a report on how the drought program is being handled by the Agriculture Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. JONES of Missouri to revise and extend his remarks on the farm bill conference report.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) and to include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLARBY (at the

request of Mr. CEDERBERG), for Tuesday, August 17, 1954 and Wednesday, August 18, 1954, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 239. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Goto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1042. An act to abolish the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Ground; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1342. An act for the relief of Irfan Kawayar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1343. An act for the relief of George Harb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1345. An act for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1504. An act for the relief of the estate of Rev. Pang Wha II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1892. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2115. An act for the relief of Gertraut Hildegard Marie Hubinger and Franz Hubinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2203. An act for the relief of Andraous Jad Suidan and Leonora Yenovkian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2692. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2694. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3108. An act to modify the act of October 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 1020) and the act of July 24, 1947 (61 Stat. 418), with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs in Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3238. An act for the relief of Johanna Schmid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3362. An act for the relief of Oskar Aszmoneit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3400. An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8753. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to establish and operate motor-vehicle pools and systems and to provide office furniture and furnishings when agencies are moved to new locations, to direct the Administrator to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and to authorize the United States Civil Service Commission to regulate operators of Government-owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9962. An act to increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3873. An act to provide survivor benefits for widows of the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of George D. Kyminas;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Israel Ratsprecher and Maryse Ratsprecher;

H. R. 803. An act for the relief of Christakis Modinos;

H. R. 804. An act for the relief of Enrichetta F. C. Meda-Novara;

H. R. 818. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emma Martha Staack;

H. R. 868. An act for the relief of Ciriaco Catino;

H. R. 905. An act for the relief of Franciszek Wolczek;

H. R. 950. An act for the relief of Panoula Panagopoulos;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of George Economos;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Dutour Rovzar;

H. R. 1171. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wai-Jan Low Fong;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Georgina Chinn;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Ilona Elizabeth Carrier;

H. R. 1646. An act for the relief of Arthur Neustadt and Mrs. Emma Neustadt;

H. R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Batke;

H. R. 1843. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Betty E. LaMay;

H. R. 1974. An act to amend the third paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 1976. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit the registration of judgments in or from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2051. An act for the relief of Ivo Markulin;

H. R. 2224. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Dr. Vahram Uluhogian;

H. R. 2359. An act for the relief of Joseph Veich, also known as Guiseppe Veic;

H. R. 2635. An act for the relief of Olga Abitia;

H. R. 2654. An act for the relief of Sisters Linda Salerno, Luigiana C. Cairo, Antonietta Impieri, Anna Impieri, Rosina Scariato, Iolanda Gaglianone, Maria Assunta Scaramuzzo, Franceschina Cauterucci, and Filomena Lupinacci;

H. R. 2793. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nagare;

H. R. 2843. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the irrigation and reclamation resources of the Waimanalo, Oahu; Waimea, Island of Hawaii, and Moikalei projects, Territory of Hawaii;

MEMORIAL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Republican Women's Club of Madison County, Mont., at Virginia City, Mont., protesting against the admission of Red China into the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 2233. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2489).

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 9115. A bill to provide that contributions received under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, for the construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use for such construction (Rept. No. 2490).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3840. A bill for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc. (Rept. No. 2491).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 17, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 16. An act to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith;

S. 22. An act to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period;

S. 154. An act for the relief of George Pantelas;

S. 232. An act for the relief of Hugo Kern;

S. 546. An act to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of Cold Brook Dam;

S. 1184. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State;

S. 1225. An act for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb Hartsworm;

S. 1308. An act for the relief of Leonard Hungerford;

S. 1706. An act to provide for taxation by the State of Wyoming of certain property located within the confines of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1748. An act to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education;

S. 1845. An act for the relief of Dr. Ian Yung-cheng Hu;

S. 1904. An act for the relief of Otilie Theresa Workmann;

S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne-marie Namias;

S. 2420. An act to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act;

S. 2456. An act for the relief of Martin Genuth;

S. 2461. An act for the relief of Berta Hellmich;

S. 2744. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2958. An act for the relief of Ida Reissmuller and Johnny Damon Eugene Reissmuller;

S. 3028. An act to require the Postmaster General to reimburse postmasters of discontinued post offices for equipment owned by the postmaster;

S. 3085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Stryk;

S. 3233. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide permanent legislation for the transportation of a substantial portion of waterborne cargoes in United States-flag vessels;

S. 3239. An act to authorize conveyance of land to the State of California for an inspection station;

S. 3302. An act granting to the Las Vegas Valley Water District, a public corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada;

S. 3303. An act granting to Basic Management, Inc., a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada;

S. 3379. An act to amend section 4 of the Flammable Fabrics Act, with respect to the standards of flammability in the case of certain textiles;

S. 3393. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to Milwaukee County, Wis.;

S. 3487. An act to authorize the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives to issue consolidated debentures, and for other purposes;

S. 3532. An act to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixedblood and fullblood members thereof; and for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the mixedblood members of said tribe; to provide a development program for the fullblood members of said tribe; and for other purposes;

S. 3546. An act to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of such merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet as are necessary for national defense;

S. 3769. An act to amend section 709 of title 18, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from commercial exploitation;

S. 3816. An act to authorize the replacement of certain Government-owned utility facilities at Glacier National Park, Mont., and Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.;

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; and

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 3877. A bill to accelerate establishment of comprehensive soil- and water-conserving works on private and public property through provision of appropriate credit for conservation, reforestation, and water-control work;

to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. GILLETTE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3878. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3879. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to require in certain cases that air carriers provide transportation for additional baggage at air-freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3880. A bill for the relief of Seiji Naya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 3881. A bill for the relief of Mari Farabullini and Alla F. Farabullini; and

S. 3882. A bill for the relief of Renato Noe and Angela Noe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3883. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

LOANS FOR CONSERVATION, REFORESTATION, AND WATER-CONTROL WORKS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to accelerate establishment of comprehensive soil- and water-conserving works on private and public property through provision of appropriate credit for conservation, reforestation, and water-control work. I do not expect to have the bill enacted at this session of Congress, but for introduction and study in the interim between the Congresses.

The present speed of establishment of conservation practices on our farms is not adequate. The chief bottleneck is long-term, low-cost credit. This bill is an effort to tailor credit for conservation programs.

Times are going to be harder for the farmer in months ahead. The rural work which would be done by the funds loaned under this bill's authority would have a beneficial effect in agricultural areas in this period of falling farm income.

Some idea of the magnitude of the conservation job still to be done in this country may be gained by looking at these figures:

Through the year 1952 soil conservation plans had been prepared for only 1,214,000 out of 5,100,000 farms in the United States, covering 350 million acres out of 1,100,000,000 acres of farmland. In Iowa, through December 31, 1952, plans had been prepared for only 37,235 out of our more than 20,000 farms, covering only 6,760,000 of our more than 34 million acres. A tremendous job remains to be done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3877) to accelerate establishment of comprehensive soil- and

water-conserving works on private and public property through provision of appropriate credit for conservation, reforestation and water-control work, introduced by Mr. GILLETTE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INCENTIVE AWARDS TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7774) to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of nominations of flag and general rank in the Army and Navy, and ask that they be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, VII Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. John Howell Collier, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general I Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, V Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Lt. Gen. John Ernest Dahlquist, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief, Army Field Forces, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States;

Col. Elmer William Young, Veterinary Corps, United States Army, for appointment as brigadier general, Veterinary Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. James Holden Phillips and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Philip Charles Bettenburg and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Bruce E. Bradley and sundry other officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy for temporary appointment; and

George W. Anderson, Jr., and sundry other officers for temporary promotion in the line of the Navy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I also report favorably from the Committee on Armed Services the following nominations, and ask that they also be placed on the Executive Calendar:

Frank H. Higgins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army;

Charles C. Flinucane, of the State of Washington, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army; William Birrell Franke, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy;

Trevor Gardner, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; and

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice H. Lee White, resigned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In addition to the above, I also report favorably from the Committee on Armed Services a group of 8,408 routine nominations in the Navy in the grade of commander and below. In order to save the expense of printing in the Executive Calendar of this large number of names, which have already appeared once in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I request that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be received and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

Article by Mr. William S. White, appearing in New York Times, concerning Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

By Mr. BEALL:

Editorial entitled "An Investment Pays Off," published in a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Benson Strategy," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of Sunday, August 15, 1954.

By Mr. HILL:

Address delivered by him at Jacksonville, Fla., July 2, 1954, on the occasion of the banquet celebrating the 10th anniversary of the Blue Cross of Florida.

FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, and requesting a con-

ference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. CASE, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. STENNIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ACCUSATION OF FAVORITISM AGAINST THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article which appeared in the morning newspapers. The particular newspaper I have in mind is the Baltimore Sun of this morning, in which Mr. Mitchell, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is reported to have cast some reflections, I believe, upon the President of the United States.

I think the Members of the Senate know that I have not been a bitter or narrow partisan in my responsibilities in the Senate. I have expressed appreciation, and I express it again, for the cooperation we have received from the official leadership of the Democratic Party in the Senate, and from Senators on the other side of the aisle, in the handling of the very heavy and burdensome legislative program which we have been facing.

I regret very much when a statement is made which, in these troublous times, appears to me to cast reflection upon the President of the United States, and to tend to break down the confidence of the country in a man who has been called to the high responsibilities of the Presidency, and who has been elected to that office by an overwhelming vote of the American people.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if Mr. Stephen Mitchell has any information which indicates in any way that the contract in question is either illegal, that undue influence has been used, or that any personal relationship between the President of the United States and any friend and neighbor, as he puts it, might have played a part, he owes it to the country, to his own party, and to a sense of responsibility to furnish any such facts to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or to the Department of Justice.

I regret very much that in the heat of what seems to be a growing political campaign, it cannot be kept on a level other than one of attacking the personal motives of the President of the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I heard with interest the comments which have been made by the distinguished majority leader. The Members of the Senate will recall that when the Dixon-Yates contract to which the article referred was being debated in the Senate in connection with the AEC bill I opposed vigorously, with all the strength at my command, the amendment which in effect approved the contract. I oppose now the conclusion of the contract. I still

by the Corps of Engineers to have an unfavorable cost-benefit ratio, and nothing had been done to survey other sites. Now the Corps of Engineers has been directed to review, for the purpose of determining a site which will be justified under the cost-benefit ratio rule, so that we may go ahead with requests for appropriations for reservoirs.

The Big Sandy Valley holds a store of great resources in coal, timber, gas and oil, and other products unmatched in the Nation. These products cannot flow to the market as they should without cheaper transportation. The development and canalization of the Big Sandy Valley will provide cheaper navigation, flood control, reservoirs, and volume of water in the river for industry and recreation. My colleague, Senator CLEMENTS, and I submit this amendment so that the Corps of Engineers will immediately make this survey in order that my colleague and I may present these new factors which I have mentioned to the Senate at an early date, so that this great project may be favorably considered and approved. I move the adoption of our amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania is willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—77

Alken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Green	McCarran
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bowring	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Jackson	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Cooper	Kefauver	Reynolds
Cordon	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Crippa	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smathers
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Langer	Stennis
Ervin	Lehman	Symington
Ferguson	Lennon	Thye
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Malone	Young
Gillette	Mansfield	

NAYS—2

Robertson Russell

NOT VOTING—17

Bridges	Eastland	McCarthy
Burke	Flanders	Sparkman
Byrd	Gore	Upton
Capehart	Hayden	Welker
Daniel	Jenner	Wiley
Douglas	Maybank	

So the bill (H. R. 9859) was passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair) appointed Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HOLLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the clerks be authorized to make any technical and typographical corrections which may be found necessary in the bill, as passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GOLDWATER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this evening.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3706) to outlaw the Communist Party, to prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REED of Illinois, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. WALTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for the continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in agriculture; and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 34, 54, 55, 59, 72, 73, 93, 103, 105, 113, 114, 126, 152, 159, and 169 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 30, 31, 38, 39, 40, 46, 49, 52, 56, 61, 62, 71½, 74, 79, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, 99, 100, 104, 110, 115, 116, 119, 122, 127, 128, 129, 132, 134, 136, 147, 148, 151, 154, 155, 164, 168, and 187 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60, 71, and 130.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Herbert Hoover, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of

State, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FRINGE EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has ready for submission a conference report which I understand has been agreed to by all the conferees. The distinguished ranking minority member of the committee is present at this time. The presentation of this matter has been postponed until now, in order that both those Senators might be present.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2263) to authorize the Postmaster General to readjust the compensation of holders of contracts for the performance of mail-messenger service. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of August 16, 1954, pp. 13893-13896, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this conference report is on what is known as the fringe employment benefits bill. The conference report is a unanimous report on the part of all the conferees, and it is signed by all the conferees for both the House and the Senate.

The report makes only a few changes. Generally speaking, the Senate version of the bill is approved. On 2 or 3 occasions the Senate voted for repeal of the so-called Whitten rider. The conferees agreed to a rewriting of the Whitten rider. It was rewritten on a basis that had at least the consent and approval of the Civil Service Commission. In other words, the Commission had not changed its view that it wished the rider repealed, but said it could live under the provisions the conferees adopted.

The conference report makes 1 or 2 changes in the provisions regarding overtime pay. It provides for full time and one-half through the minimum rate for grade 9.

Mr. President, let me say by way of summary of the conference report that the Senate version of the bill provided for full time and one-half overtime pay up through the maximum rate for grade 9. The conference agreement provides for full time and one-half through the minimum rate for grade 9.

The Senate version provided that overtime pay could not be less than straight time. The conference agreement omits this provision.

The Senate version excluded fire fighters from the category of employees who

may be paid 25-percent premium compensation in lieu of overtime pay for irregular overtime. The conference agreement eliminates this exclusion.

The Senate version contained no limit on incentive awards payable under the bill. The conferees added a \$5,000 limit generally, with a provision under which awards up to \$25,000 could be made with the approval of the Civil Service Commission in special cases.

The Senate version provided that up to \$100 per annum could be paid to employees required to wear uniforms, to assist in defraying the cost of acquisition or upkeep of their uniforms. The conference agreement eliminates reference to upkeep; and also provides that the head of the department may furnish uniforms in lieu of paying the uniform allowance.

The Senate version repealed the Whitten rider. The conference agreement modifies, but does not repeal, this provision. Under the modification, permanent appointments could be made up to 10 percent above the total number of employees employed on September 1, 1950. In addition, it authorizes permanent reinstatements and promotions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSONNEL OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is prepared to submit the conference report on House bill 9924, relating to military family housing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The conference report is signed by all the conferees; is it not?

Mr. CASE. Yes; the report is signed by all the conferees on behalf of both the House and the Senate.

There was only one principal item of controversy or discussion in the conference, and it related to the amount of for-

eign currencies which might be used in the acquisition of housing overseas. In the conference report, the amount of foreign currencies which may be used for the procurement of military housing overseas is reduced from \$75 million to \$25 million. Some of the conferees felt that since this was an experimental program or at least a new departure, the smaller amount should be used initially.

Furthermore, the language agreed to by the conferees authorizes the transfer of unexpended balances of appropriations for quarters allowances to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of foreign currencies used in any fiscal year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the conference report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

H. R. 9924 TO PROVIDE FOR FAMILY QUARTERS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The principal item on which the Houses disagreed was the Senate provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense to procure family housing in foreign countries in the amount of \$75 million by using foreign currencies acquired through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities as authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.).

Paragraph 3 of section 407 of the Senate bill provided that appropriations for quarters allowances for personnel occupying family housing procured in this manner would be available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the foreign currencies used. This provision contemplated an annual transfer of appropriations that otherwise would be available for the payment of quarters allowances to personnel occupying the housing until the Commodity Credit Corporation had received full reimbursement for the currencies that had been acquired by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The House position was that there should be authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to be reimbursed within the period of the fiscal year in which the foreign currencies were used for the procurement of housing in an amount equivalent to the total dollar value of the currencies used.

The language agreed to in conference authorizes the transfer of unexpended balances of appropriations for quarters allowances to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of foreign currencies used in any fiscal year. The extent of the authority for the procurement of family housing in foreign countries through the use of funds acquired by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities was reduced from \$75 million to \$25 million.

The compromise language relative to the reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation presupposes the existence of unexpended balances of appropriations for quarters allowances. Since the extent of the monetary authorization for this purpose was reduced to \$25 million, the conferees have reason to believe that unexpended balances in this amount will be available for the purpose of reimbursement in full to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If this method of procuring family housing in foreign countries proves feasible, and the Congress in future years should decide to

expand this authority, the subject of reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities used in generating foreign currencies can be reexamined at that time.

I should like to say that the Senate conferees are no less desirous than their counterparts in the House that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be unfairly charged with the cost of military housing. I believe that the language agreed to by the conferees is a satisfactory solution of the problem of Commodity Credit Corporation reimbursement, at least for the authority contained in this act, and I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN OFFENSES BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2308) to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 9, strike out all after "Code", over through "States)" in line 1, page 2, and on page 2, line 12, after "complaint", insert "Provided, That, the provisions of this section shall not limit, in any way, the existing authority of the military departments to investigate persons or offenses over which the Armed Forces have jurisdiction under the Uniform Code of Military Justice: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not limit, in any way, the primary authority of the Postmaster General to investigate postal offenses."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this bill was amended by the House of Representatives in order to take care of a question raised by the Department of the Army in order to safeguard its right to have certain investigations made in the Defense Department. The amendment has been cleared with the Department of Justice, and is in complete agreement with the spirit of the bill, as introduced.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 644, House bill 6287, to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, and on which additional amendments had been reported by the Finance Committee on May 18, 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk, on behalf of the majority leader and myself, a proposed unanimous-consent agreement regarding the time available for the consideration of this bill and the amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of Calendar No. 644, House bill 6287, an act to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, debate on any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding one-half hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in the event he is opposed to any such amendment or motion; otherwise, by the mover and the minority leader: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received: *And provided further*, That debate upon the bill itself shall be limited to not exceeding one hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, it is agreed to.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado. Will the Senator from Colorado state how much time he desires to yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall now present my opening statement. We have not reached the question of amendments. What time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a time limit on the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield myself 10 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may have whatever time he wishes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. On May 19, 1954, the Committee on Finance reported additional amendments to the bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951. I move that the previous committee amendments and the additional amendments be agreed to en bloc and made a part of the bill, as though it were a clean copy, and that the bill then be subject to further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, after line 5, to insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 105 (f) (1) of such act is amended by striking out '\$250,000' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '\$250,000, in the case of a fiscal year ending before June 30, 1953, or \$500,000 in the case of a fiscal year ending on or after June 30, 1953.'

"(b) Section 105 (f) (3) of such act is amended by inserting in the second sentence thereof, after 'the \$250,000 amount' the following: ', the \$500,000 amount,'"

On page 2, line 3, to change the section number from "2" to "3"; in line 24, to change the section number from "3" to "4."

On page 3, after line 14, to strike out:

"Sec. 4. Section 106 (d) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) any contract or subcontract for the making or furnishing of a standard commercial article, if, in the opinion of the Board, competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article are such as will reasonably protect the Government against excessive prices."

And insert:

"Sec. 5. (a) Section 106 (a) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

"(8) any contract or subcontract for the making or furnishing of a standard commercial article, unless the Board makes a specific finding that competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article are such as will not reasonably protect the Government from excessive prices. For the purpose of this paragraph—

"(A) The term 'article' includes any material, part, assembly, machinery, equipment, or other personal property; and

"(B) The term 'standard commercial article' means an article—

"(1) which is substantially identical in every material respect with an article which was manufactured and sold, and in general civilian, industrial, or commercial use, prior to June 1, 1950, or

"(2) which is substantially identical in every material respect with an article which is manufactured and sold, as a competitive product, by more than one manufacturer, or which is an article of the same kind and having the same use or uses as an article manufactured and sold, as a competitive product, by more than one manufacturer, or

"(3) which is the subject of any prime contract entered into pursuant to competitive bidding.

An article made in whole or in part of substitute materials but otherwise identical in every material respect with the article with which it is compared under clause (1) or (2) shall be considered as identical in every material respect with such article with which it is so compared."

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to fiscal years (as defined in section 103 (h) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951) ending on or after June 30, 1953."

On page 5, line 13, to change the section number from "5" to "6."

The additional amendments reported by Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance on May 19, 1954, and agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 3, after line 2, insert the following:

"(b) Paragraph (1) of section 106 (c) of such act is further amended by inserting '(A)' after the word 'except' and by adding before the period at the end of such paragraph the following: 'and (B) to receipts and accruals from contracts for new durable productive equipment in cases in which the Board finds that the new durable productive equipment covered by such contracts cannot be adapted, converted, or retooled for commercial use.'"

On page 3, line 3, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)."

On page 3, line 11, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

On page 3, lines 11 and 12, strike out "subsections (a) and (b)" and insert "subsections (a), (b), and (c)."

Beginning on page 3, line 24, strike out all through line 12 on page 5 and insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 106 (a) of such act is hereby amended—

"(1) by striking out, in paragraph (7), 'by reason of this subsection,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'by reason of any paragraph, other than paragraph (8), of this subsection; or'; and

"(2) by adding at the end of such section the following:

"(8) any contract or subcontract for the making or furnishing of a standard commercial article, unless the Board makes a specific finding that competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article are such as will not reasonably prevent excessive profits. This paragraph shall apply to any such contract or subcontract only if (1) the contractor or subcontractor files, at such time and in such form and detail as the Board shall by regulations prescribe, such information and data as may be required by the Board under its regulations for the purpose of enabling it to reach a decision with respect to the making of a specific finding under this paragraph, and (2) within a period of 6 months after the date of filing of such information and data, the Board fails to make a specific finding that competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article are such as will not reasonably prevent excessive profits, or (3) within such 6-month period, the Board makes a specific finding that competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article are such as will reasonably prevent excessive profits. Any contractor or subcontractor may waive the exemption provided in this paragraph with respect to receipts or accruals in any fiscal year by including a statement to such effect in the financial statement filed by such contractor or subcontractor for such fiscal year pursuant to section 105 (e) (1). Any specific finding of the Board under this paragraph shall not be reviewed or redetermined by any court or agency other than by the Tax Court of the United States in a proceeding for a redetermination of the amount of excessive profits determined by an order of the Board. For the purpose of this paragraph—

"(A) the term 'article' includes any material, part, component, assembly, machinery, equipment, or other personal property;

"(B) the term 'standard commercial article' means an article—

"(1) which, in the normal course of business, is customarily manufactured for stock, and is customarily maintained in stock by the manufacturer or any dealer, distributor, or other commercial agency for the marketing of such article; or

"(2) which is manufactured and sold by more than two persons for general civilian industrial or commercial use, or which is identical in every material respect with an article so manufactured and sold;

"(C) the term 'identical in every material respect' means of the same kind, manufactured of the same or substitute materials, and having the same industrial or commercial use or uses, without necessarily being of identical specifications; and

"(D) the term 'persons' does not include any person under control of, or controlling, or under common control with any other person considered for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (2) of this paragraph."

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to contracts with the Departments and subcontracts only to the extent of the amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor after December 31, 1953."

On page 5, after line 12, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 106 (a) (4) of such act is hereby amended by striking out 'or' at the end thereof and inserting the following: 'and to such furnishing or sale in any case in which the Board finds the regulatory aspects of rates for such furnishing or sale, or the type and nature of the contract for such furnishing or sale, are such as to indicate, in the opinion of the Board, that excessive profits are improbable; or.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to fiscal years (as defined in sec. 103 (h) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951) ending on or after December 31, 1953."

On page 5, after line 12, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 7. (a) Section 105 (d) of such act is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the last sentence thereof and inserting the following: 'and shall also have the power to set aside and declare null and void any such agreement if, upon a request made to the Board within 3 years from the date of such agreement, the Board finds as a fact that the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued by the other party to such agreement during the fiscal year covered by such agreement was not more than the minimum amounts subject to renegotiation specified in section 105 (f) for such fiscal year.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective as if it were a part of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 on the date of its enactment."

On page 5, strike out lines 13 through 15 and insert the following:

"SEC. 8. Section 201 (h) of such act is hereby amended by striking out '2 years' and inserting in lieu thereof '4 years', and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'If any such case has been dismissed by any court for failure to substitute for the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board prior to the effective date of this sentence, such case is hereby revived and reinstated in such court as if it had not been dismissed.'"

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill as now amended is open to further amendment.

MR. MILLIKIN. This bill was discussed by me in the Senate on July 29, 1953, but was withdrawn pending further study by the committee. Your committee, after hearing the full Renegotiation Board, has reported certain additional amendments. Because of the lapse of time since the matter was before the Senate, my discussion is intended to cover a detailed explanation of the bill in its entirety.

Section 1 of the bill extends the renegotiation authority for 1 year, to December 31, 1954. Unless the Renegotiation Act is extended, amounts received or accrued by defense contractors and subcontractors during 1954 will not be subject to renegotiation and the Government will not be adequately protected against payment of excessive prices in the execution of the national defense program. Under the bill renegotiation will not be applicable to receipts or accruals attributable to performance after December 31, 1954.

Section 2 of the bill is the same as that contained in the bill reported by our committee last year. This section raises the minimum amount subject to renegotiation from \$250,000 to \$500,000 with respect to fiscal years ending on

and after June 30, 1953. This amendment has the approval of the Board, since it will permit the Board to concentrate on the larger cases, and therefore facilitate administration of the act. The number of filings has been about 40,000 for each of the calendar years 1951 and 1952. Filings for 1953, normally due on April 1, 1954, were postponed by the Board due to pending legislation.

Section 3 of the bill remains unchanged. This section amends section 106 (a) (6) of the act, relating to mandatory exemptions. The amendment makes it clear that there should be exempt from renegotiation contracts with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for materials and services to be used in the manufacture and sale of synthetic rubber to the extent that such materials or services are required for the manufacture of synthetic rubber for sale thereof to a private person or private persons for nondefense purposes. The Board concurs in the desirability of this provision and has already caused a directive to be issued to that effect.

Section 4 of the bill relates to the relief provided for in section 106 (c) of the act for durable productive equipment. Under the existing law certain special relief was granted for new durable productive equipment with respect to subcontracts. The House bill extends this relief to contracts direct with the Government. For example, under the House bill, if the Government purchases for its own account a \$100,000 machine tool having an estimated useful life of 20 years, the portion of the profits subject to renegotiation will be the proportion which 5 years bears to the estimated life, which is one-fourth. The committee amendment denies this relief in the case of contracts with the Government in cases where the Board finds that the new durable productive equipment covered by such contract cannot be adapted, converted, or retooled for commercial use. The Board has approved of this amendment.

Section 5 of the reported bill provided a mandatory exemption for standard commercial articles unless the Board made a specific finding that competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article were such as will not reasonably protect the Government from excessive prices. Your committee has reconsidered this amendment particularly because it was felt that the Board did not have a sufficient investigative staff to make such a determination in the first instance. Under the changed version, which the Board states is administratively feasible, it is required, first, that the specific finding be made as to "excessive profits" instead of "excessive prices"; second, that the contractor or subcontractor file information with the Board containing sufficient data to enable the Board to make such a finding; and third, that if within 6 months after the date such information is filed the Board does not make a specific finding that competitive conditions affecting the sale of such article are such as will not reasonably prevent excessive profits, the exemption will apply. Under the amendment the Board may make a specific

alien shepherders (p. 14245).

10. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 5499, authorizing the Michaud Flats project, Idaho (p. 14239). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Passed with amendments H. R. 2235, to authorize the Santa Maria project, Calif. Rejected, 17-47, an amendment by Sen. Morse eliminating the provision making an exception as to the 160-acre limitation in this project. (pp. 14286-8, 14290-304.)

River

S. 1555, to authorize the upper Colo./project, was made the unfinished business (p. 14304).

11. EDUCATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 3628, to provide a permanent program of assistance for school construction (p. 14262). This bill will now be sent to the President.

12. WATER COMPACT. Passed with amendments S. 2821, consenting to a compact among States for disposition of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries (pp. 14239-40, 14284-6).

13. NOMINATION of Herbert Hoover, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State, was confirmed (p. 14207).

14. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS. Discussed and, on objection of Sen. Smathers, passed over S. 3067, to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the U. S., be transmitted to the Senate within 30 days after execution thereof (pp. 14241-2).

15. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Langer explained why he was absent during the vote on the conference report on H. R. 9680, the farm program bill, and said he would have voted against the report (p. 14223).

16. FARM PROGRAM; ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Goldwater, in discussing some of the dangers confronting our economic system, criticized high rigid price supports and stated that the administration has taken a "very courageous and long needed step in the farm program," and Sen. Kefauver suggested these 3 factors to reduce agricultural surpluses: Increase employment to enlarge purchasing power, improve the school-lunch program, and lower tariffs (pp. 14209-13).

HOUSE

17. FLOOD CONTROL. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 9859, the omnibus flood-control bill, which includes a provision authorizing 20,000,000 additional to this Department for work on watersheds (pp. 14175-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.

18. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 2263, the fringe-benefits personnel bill (pp. 14172-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Agreed to the Senate amendment to H. R. 9909, to prohibit payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses. The amendment extends from 3 to 5 years the statute of limitations on certain crimes. (pp. 14174-5.) This bill will now be sent to the President.

Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 9709, to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, which includes a provision extending it to Federal employees (p. 14197). This bill will now be sent to the President.

19. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9924, to provide for family housing for military personnel and their dependents, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to procure such housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies obtained through sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and to make Defense Department appropriations available to reimburse CCC in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used (p. 14175). This bill will now be sent to the President.
20. FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1955. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees agreed to file a conference report on this bill, H. R. 10051, and that: "As agreed by the conferees the bill would provide total new funds of \$2,781,499,816, a decrease from the Senate- and House-passed versions of \$9,325,000 and \$114,445,184, respectively. The figure agreed upon added to unobligated funds of \$2,462,075,979 would make a grand total of \$5,243,575,795. (p. D1004).
21. RECLAMATION. Vacated the proceedings of Aug. 17 whereby H. R. 8498, to authorize the Palo Verde project, Calif., was sent to conference, and concurred in the Senate amendments to the bill (pp. 14171-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
22. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Brown (Ga.) urged that Ga. be declared a major disaster area and stated that in more than 100 counties the grain crop is "practically destroyed" (p. 14178).
23. ADVISORY COMMITTEES; PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Polk criticized the agricultural advisory committees and claimed that "almost none" of the reductions in prices received by farmers are being passed on to the consumers (pp. 14193-7).
24. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Eberharter spoke in favor of his bill, H. R. 9703, to provide assistance to communities, business enterprises and individuals in order to facilitate the adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the U. S. (pp. 14190-1).
25. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Legislative Reporting Staff has obtained a supply of a House Agriculture Committee print, "The Drought Program, an Explanation of the Government's Program, in Cooperation with the States and Individual Farmers, to Combat the Effects of Drought."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

26. SMALL BUSINESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hill commending the Small Business Administration and stating that it is "assisting our National economy to grow stronger and to stabilize our home-owned-and-operated business firms" (pp. A6131-2).
27. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Burdick criticizing the administration's farm program and stating that "the acreage cut which Benson has made will put many small farms out of business" (p. A6135).
Extension of remarks of Rep. Hill discussing "the present situation of agriculture" and giving a brief report on the farm bill (pp. A6139-40).

victed of certain offenses, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 10, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 10. (a) Section 3282 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'three' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to offenses (1) committed on or after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) committed prior to such date, if on such date prosecution therefor is not barred by provisions of law in effect prior to such date."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] if the amendment to the bill as passed by the House affects the annuities of those persons who are already receiving annuities or does it affect the annuities of those which have been granted Presidential pardons?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The answer to both questions is categorically no.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 17, 1954.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF GAVINS POINT RESERVOIR BACK OF GAVINS POINT DAM TO LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3744) to change the name of Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam to Lewis and Clark Lake.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam, which is located on the Missouri River near Yankton, S. Dak., shall hereafter be known as Lewis and Clark Lake and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to under the name of Gavins Point Reservoir shall be held to refer to such body of water under and by the name of Lewis and Clark Lake.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION FOR THE ENLARGING OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1042) to abolish the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, created by the act of April 11, 1928 (45 Stat. 420), having fully executed all the duties imposed upon it by law, accomplished the purposes for which it was created, settled all accounts, and submitted its final report to Congress, is hereby dissolved and the members of such Commission discharged from any further duties in connection with the matters heretofore committed by law to such Commission.

SEC. 2. Any revocable permits now in effect, heretofore granted by the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, to owners of properties adjacent to the Capitol Grounds, for construction, maintenance and use of walkways, approaches, or driveways in the Capitol Grounds, providing access to such properties from the Capitol Grounds, subject to revocation by such Commission or by the Architect of the Capitol, shall continue in effect, subject to revocation by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction and approval of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Architect of the Capitol, with the approval of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is authorized hereafter to grant similar revocable permits to the owners of any properties adjacent to the Capitol Grounds whenever such action is deemed necessary to provide proper access to such properties from the Capitol Grounds; and such permits shall be in the form of an agreement saving the United States harmless from and against any and all claims of any nature or kind that may arise from anything that may be connected with or grow out of such permits, and containing such other provisions and conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may deem necessary or proper.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN PUBLIC-USE TERMINAL PROPERTIES NOW OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 170 to approve the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress, pursuant to section 4 (k) (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (55 Stat. 599-600; 16 U. S. C. 831c (k) (b)), hereby approves the conveyance of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the name of the United States, by deed, lease, or otherwise, for the purposes of said section 4 (k) (b) and on the basis of the fair sale or rental value determined by the Tennessee Valley Authority, of the public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States and in the custody of the Tennessee Valley Authority at Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Harriman, Tenn., and Decatur and Gunterville, Ala.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, after line 9, insert:

"Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: In accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document No. 358, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$91,389,000."

Page 6, after line 20, insert:

"The existing modified project for Wilmington Harbor, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 87, 81st Congress, is hereby further modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon widening of the transition channel at the lower end of the anchorage basin, subsequent to May 17, 1950, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project modification adopted in said act, provided that such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$65,000."

Page 6, after line 20, insert:

"Charleston Harbor, S. C.: Senate Document No. 136, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$200,000."

Page 7, after line 7, insert:

"Carrabelle Harbor, Fla.: House Document No. 451, 83d Congress (maintenance of existing channel)."

Page 7, after line 22, insert:

"Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.: Modification of existing project in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$877,000."

Page 8, after line 19, insert:

"Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: House Document No. 487, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$180,000."

Page 9, line 12, after "approved", insert: "Provided, That such authorization shall include the acquisition of lands necessary for wildlife purposes as outlined in said Senate Document No. 81."

Page 10, after line 11, insert:

"Saginaw River, Mich.: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 7, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,496,800."

Page 10, after line 13, insert:

"Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 486, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,900,000."

Page 11, after line 24, insert:

"Richmond Harbor, Calif.: House Document No. 395, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,086,000."

Page 12, after line 5, insert:

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 128, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,500,000."

Page 12, lines 19 and 20, strike out "House Document No. —, 83d Congress" and insert "In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 27, 1954."

Page 13, after line 11, insert:

"Tacoma Harbor, Wash.: Modification of existing project to provide for 30-foot channel in Port Industrial (Wapato) Waterway, in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$634,200."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Sitka Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,500."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Dry Pass, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,419,800."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Neva Strait, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$224,400."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Petersburg Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$40,000."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Pelican Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$270,000."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Ketchikan Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$2,947,900."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Rocky Pass in Keku Strait, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$214,000."

Page 13, after line 24, insert:

"Kodiak Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 465, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,685,000."

Page 14, after line 3, insert:

"Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, T. H.: House Document No. 453, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,166,400."

Page 15, line 24, strike out "\$1,176,400" and insert "\$1,180,400."

Page 17, strike out lines 13 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

"Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause pre-

liminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities, and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Eastern River, at and in the vicinity of

Orland, Maine;

"Southwest Harbor, Maine;

"Vicinity of Wells Beach and Drakes Island,

Maine;

"Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington;

"Lake Tarpon (formerly Lake Butler), Fla., to determine the cause of salt water intrusion and corrective measures with respect thereto; and

"Chipola River, Fla., for measures to maintain satisfactory water levels in the Dead Lakes;

"Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia."

Page 18, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 105. The authorization of the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River (H. Doc. No. 371, 75th Cong.) authorized in the River and Harbor Act of 1945 and modified by the River and Harbor Act of 1948 and the River and Harbor Act of 1950 is further modified so as to authorize the use of alternate route C-1 in the Venice and Lemon Bay, Fla., area, as designated in plans of the Corps of Engineers.

"The Chief of Engineers is directed to report to the Congress prior to request for appropriation to construct this part of the project his recommendation as to the fair amount of local contribution in the light of the changed condition. Provisions as to local contribution based on these recommendations shall become effective when approved by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Page 18, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 106. That the requirement, that local interests provide the ferries and bridges required for land traffic across the lateral and terminal canals, with respect to the river and harbor project authorized by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson, shall hereafter be ineffective: *Provided*, That local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will hold and save the United States free from any claim for damage which might result from deprivation of access to the area."

Page 18, line 10, strike out "105" and insert "107."

Page 21, after line 18, insert:

"The plan for flood protection on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pa., and N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 25, 1954, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$25 million for partial accomplishment of that plan."

Page 23, line 7, strike out "as concurred in by" and insert "and."

Page 23, line 8, strike out "dated April 8, 1954" and insert "in House Document No. 478, 83d Congress."

Page 24, after line 18, insert:

"(e) The plan for flood control in the Reelfoot Lake area, Tennessee and Kentucky, substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 17, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$748,100."

Page 24, after line 18, insert:

"Trinity River Basin, Tex."

"The project for the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated May 28, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,969,000."

Page 25, after line 10, insert:

"The project for the Belton Reservoir, Leon River, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby modified to provide for the reservation, without reimbursement, of 12,000 acre-feet of conservation storage to be used as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood and adjacent military installations."

Page 28, line 9, strike out "under section 2."

Page 28, after line 23, insert:

"Pecos River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Pecos River, Texas and New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 26, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$9,540,000: *Provided*, That no appropriations shall be made for construction of Los Esteros Reservoir until satisfactory arrangements have been made by the State of New Mexico for the transfer of irrigation storage from the Alamogordo Reservoir."

Page 30, after line 3, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Conway County Drainage and Levee District No. 1, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 167, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$230,600."

Page 30, after line 3, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Holla Bend Bottom, Ark., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$312,000."

Page 30, after line 10, insert:

"The project for flood protection on Bear Creek at Hannibal, Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,326,000."

Page 33, after line 9, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its report dated March 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$3,430,000."

Page 33, after line 15, insert:

"The general comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 191, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document No. 247, 78th Congress, 2d session, approved in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, are hereby modified to include the payment by the Corps of Engineers for construction or provision of adequate water supply and sewage facilities in the new relocated municipality of Pollock, S. Dak., at a cost not to exceed \$200,000, which is to compensate for the acquisition of and to replace facilities in the town which are located within areas which have been or will be acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project in the basin."

Page 33, after line 21, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Lower Heart River in the vicinity of Mandan, N. Dak., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated July 27, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$1,727,000."

Page 34, lines 12 and 13, strike out "House Document No. —, 83d Congress" and insert "his report dated June 23, 1954."

Public Law 765 - 83d Congress

Chapter 1210 - 2d Session

H. R. 9924

AN ACT

All 68 Stat. 1119.

To provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Army, Navy,
Air Force fam-
ily housing.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop ^{Army.} military installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and the acquisition of land, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Third Army Area)

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Three hundred units of family housing, \$4,093,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Two hundred and fifty units of family housing, \$3,213,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Six hundred units of family housing, \$8,099,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Camp Carson, Colorado: One thousand units of family housing, \$13,427,000.

Camp Crowder, Missouri: Seventy units of family housing, \$952,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Washington: Eight hundred units of family housing, \$10,686,000.

Camp Cooke (United States Disciplinary Barracks), California: Fifty units of family housing, \$663,000.

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Twenty units of family housing, \$267,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Belle Mead General Depot, New Jersey: Ten units of family housing, \$158,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Thirty units of family housing, \$486,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Two hundred units of family housing, \$2,899,000.

Department of the Army Transmitting Station, Virginia: Ten units of family housing, \$164,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Three hundred units of family housing, \$3,984,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Two hundred and fifty units of family housing, \$3,374,000.

Wilmington Ammunition Terminal, North Carolina: Four units of family housing, \$69,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Ten units of family housing, \$160,000.

(Armed Forces Special Weapons Project)

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Three units of family housing, \$79,000.
Killeen Base, Texas: Five units of family housing, \$99,000.

(Tactical Sites)

Various locations: Three hundred units of family housing, \$3,990,000.

Rehabilitation of
public works.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is authorized further to develop military installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$12,230,550: *Provided*, That in his discretion the Secretary of the Army may utilize the authorization contained in this section to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and acquisition of land, at locations to be determined by him. Such family housing shall be in addition to, but shall not exceed 5 per centum of, the total number of units authorized by section 101 of this Act, but the average cost of such additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

TITLE II

Navy.

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(First Naval District)

Naval hospital, Newport, Rhode Island: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Third Naval District)

Naval hospital, Saint Albans, New York: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Fourth Naval District)

Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Fifth Naval District)

Naval hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Fifty units of family housing, \$642,500.

Marine Corps air facility, New River, North Carolina: Thirty-five units of family housing, \$473,300.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Virginia (Skiffes Creek Annex): Five units of family housing, \$91,200.

(Sixth Naval District)

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Florida: Ninety units of family housing, \$1,192,200.

Naval hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Thirty units of family housing, \$397,300.

Naval air station, Key West, Florida: Twenty units of family housing, \$273,900.

Naval station, Key West, Florida: Eighty units of family housing, \$1,044,500.

Naval mine countermeasures station, Panama City, Florida: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$343,100.

Naval hospital, Pensacola, Florida: Twenty-five units of family housing, \$321,300.

Naval supply corps school, Athens, Georgia: Thirty units of family housing, \$456,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Glynnco, Georgia: Eighty units of family housing, \$1,058,600.

Naval construction battalion center, Gulfport, Mississippi: Seven units of family housing, \$102,100.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, South Carolina: One hundred and seventy-five units of family housing \$2,305,600.

Naval hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina: Fifty units of family housing, \$654,300.

(Eighth Naval District)

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Texas: Eighty units of family housing, \$1,073,400.

(Eleventh Naval District)

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, California: Two units of family housing, \$47,300.

Naval air station, Miramar, California: Fifteen units of family housing, \$204,500.

Naval hospital, San Diego, California: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

(Twelfth Naval District)

Naval hospital, Oakland, California: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, California: Ten units of family housing, \$152,000.

Naval communication station, Skaggs Island, California: Fifty units of family housing, \$666,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nevada: Sixty units of family housing, \$787,500.

MARINE CORPS FACILITIES

Marine Corps depot of supplies, Albany, Georgia: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,339,800.

Marine Corps supply annex, Barstow, California: One unit of family housing, \$27,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, California: Twelve units of family housing, \$173,400.

Marine Corps school, Quantico, Virginia: Three hundred units of family housing, \$4,121,700.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Atlantic Ocean Area)

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Forty-five units of family housing, \$595,100.

Naval base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,379,000.

(Pacific Ocean Area)

Naval station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: One hundred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$2,289,100.

Marine Corps barracks, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: Two units of family housing, \$30,400.

Rehabilitation of public works. SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized further to develop naval installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the rehabilitation of public works, which include appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of \$1,218,300: *Provided*, That in his discretion the Secretary of the Navy may utilize the authorization contained in this section to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment and acquisition of land, at locations to be determined by him. Such family housing shall be in addition to, but shall not exceed 5 per centum of, the total number of units authorized by section 201 of this Act, but the average cost of such additional units shall not exceed \$12,500.

TITLE III

Air Force.

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized further to develop Air Force installations and facilities by providing family housing for personnel of the military departments and their dependents by the construction or installation of public works, which include site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, equipment, and the acquisition of land as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Strategic Air Command)

Sedalia Air Force Base, Missouri: Four hundred units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma: Three hundred and sixty units of family housing, \$4,827,600.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebraska: Four hundred units of family housing, \$5,364,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Kansas: Two hundred and eighty units of family housing, \$3,754,800.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine: Three hundred units of family housing, \$4,023,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Louisiana: Two hundred units of family housing, \$2,682,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

Great Falls Air Force Base, Montana: Four units of family housing, \$87,750.

Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi: Thirty units of family housing, \$402,300.

Larson Air Force Base, Washington: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

Limestone Air Force Base, Maine: Four units of family housing, \$87,750.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio: Four units of family housing, \$87,750.

Mather Air Force Base, California: Four units of family housing, \$87,750.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho: Four units of family housing, \$81,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

Travis Air Force Base, California: Six units of family housing, \$128,250.

(Air Defense Command)

Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts: Two hundred units of family housing, \$2,682,000.

Newcastle County Airport, Delaware: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Truax Air Force Base, Wisconsin: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Michigan: Ninety units of family housing, \$1,206,900.

Paine Air Force Base, Washington: Seventy units of family housing, \$938,700.

Oxnard Air Force Base, California: Seventy units of family housing, \$938,700.

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado: Ninety units of family housing, \$1,206,900.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Pennsylvania: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

Niagara Municipal Airport, New York: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

Minneapolis-Saint Paul Airport, Minnesota: Seventy units of family housing, \$938,700.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Minnesota: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Geiger Field, Washington: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Iowa: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Maine: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

McGee-Tyson Airport, Tennessee: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

Portland International Airport, Oregon: Sixty units of family housing, \$804,600.

Minot area, North Dakota: Sixty-five units of family housing, \$871,650.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan: Fifty units of family housing, \$670,500.

(Tactical Air Command)

Clovis Air Force Base, New Mexico: One hundred and seventy units of family housing, \$2,279,700.

Hurlburt Air Force Base, Florida: Two hundred and seventy-five units of family housing, \$3,687,750.

Foster Air Force Base, Texas: Two hundred units of family housing, \$2,682,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

(Air Training Command)

Luke Air Force Base, Arizona: One hundred and twenty-five units of family housing, \$1,676,250.

Laredo Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Gary Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred units of family housing, \$1,341,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas: One hundred and fifty units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

Greenville Air Force Base, Mississippi: One hundred and twenty units of family housing, \$1,609,200.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia: One hundred and forty units of family housing, \$1,877,400.

Stead Air Force Base, Nevada: Ninety units of family housing, \$1,206,900.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas: One hundred and fifty units of family housing, \$2,011,500.

Webb Air Force Base, Texas: Eighty-five units of family housing, \$1,139,850.

Parks Air Force Base, California: Eighty-five units of family housing, \$1,139,850.

(Military Air Transport Service)

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina: Four hundred and fifty units of family housing, \$6,034,500.

(Continental Air Command)

Beale Air Force Base, California: Two hundred and twenty-five units of family housing, \$3,017,250.

(Research and Development Command)

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico: Five units of family housing, \$108,000.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are respectively authorized to proceed with the further development of military, naval, and Air Force installations and facilities as authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act without regard to the provisions of sections 1136, 3648, and 3734, as respectively amended, of the Revised Statutes, and prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes. The authority to provide family housing by the construction or installation of public works shall include authority to acquire lands and rights and interests thereto or therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise.

10 USC 1339;
31 USC 529;
40 USC 259.
33 USC 733.

SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$175,000,000 to carry out the purposes of titles I, II, and III, and not to exceed \$15,000,000 to carry out the purposes of section 408 of this Act.

Appropriation.

SEC. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be varied upward by 10 per centum, but the total of all costs shall not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 404. Not to exceed two hundred and fifty of the units of family quarters constructed under the authority of titles I, II, and III of this Act shall have a net floor area of not to exceed two thousand and one hundred square feet. None of the other family quarters authorized to be constructed by this Act shall have a net floor area in excess of one thousand two hundred and fifty square feet, and the average net floor area of all of such other family quarters shall not exceed one thousand and eighty square feet.

Net floor areas.

SEC. 405. Appropriation made to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be available for expenses incident to construction or rehabilitation work authorized by this Act, including administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

Administrative funds, etc.

SEC. 406. Whenever—

(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this Act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this Act; and

65 Stat. 700.
41 USC 254, 153.

(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts, the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress.

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing, in addition to family housing otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense in foreign countries, to the value of \$25,000,000 through the use of foreign currencies in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress).

Use of foreign currencies.

Ante, p. 454.

The Department of Defense shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a dollar amount equivalent to the value of the foreign currencies used during any fiscal year pursuant to the authority contained in this section. For the purpose of such reimbursement, the

Reimbursement of CCC.

Department of Defense may utilize appropriations otherwise available for the payment of quarters allowances for military personnel.

Reports to
Congress.

The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a quarterly report, the first of which shall be submitted three months subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, setting forth the cost, number, and location of housing units constructed or acquired pursuant to the authority contained in this section during the three-month period preceding the date of such report, and setting forth the cost, number, and location of the housing units intended to be constructed or acquired pursuant to such authority during the next succeeding quarter.

Trailers.

SEC. 408. The Secretaries of the military departments are authorized to acquire a total of not to exceed five thousand units of trailers which may be made available at locations both inside and outside continental United States for occupancy by military personnel and their dependents on a rental basis without loss of any allowances for quarters.

Approved September 1, 1954.